

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- - - - -

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- - - - -

SCOPING MEETING

- - - - -

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

- - - - -

The meeting was held in the Ballroom at the
Marriott Hotel, 1401 S.W. Front Street,
Portland, Oregon, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

JIM PARHAM, Facilitator

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE Headquarters)

COLETTE BROWN, PEIS Project Manager,
Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology
SHANE JOHNSON, Program Manager
RAJ SHARMA, NEPA Compliance Officer
EARL WAHLQUIST
CHRIS KARIS

U.S. Department of Energy (Richland, WA, Operations)

DOUG CHAPIN
AL FARABEE
GAIL McCLURE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Facilitator:	Jim Parham	
Opening Statement:	Colette Brown	
Presentation:	Colette Brown	
Question and Answer Session:		p. 16
Formal Comment Session:		
U.S. Senator Slade Gorton (WA)		p. 33
U.S. Representative Adam Smith (WA)		p. 38
U.S. Representative Brian Baird (WA)		p. 39
U.S. Representative Jim McDermott (WA)		p. 39
U.S. Representative Elizabeth Furse (OR)		p. 43
Oregon State Senator Charles Starr		p. 46
Charlie Hales		
City Commission, Portland, OR		p. 47
John A. Kitzhaber		
Governor, State of Oregon		p. 49
Ken Dobbin		p. 52
City Council, West Richland, WA		
Marnie Loomis		p. 57
Marshall Goldberg		p. 59
Len Porter		p. 62
Barbara Drageaux		p. 66
Women's International League		
for Peace and Freedom		
Dick Belsey		p. 68
Nancy Korb		p. 69
Gaylord Pearsall		p. 72
Mark Arienso		p. 73
Bill Meade		p. 74
Public Safety Resources Agency (OR)		
John Boland		p. 82
Ann Frye		p. 86
Shelley Simone		p. 87
Jennifer Aldrich		p. 91
Physicians for Social Responsibility,		
Oregon Chapter		
Bob Schenter		p. 93
American Nuclear Society		
of Eastern Washington		
Marlene Oliver		p. 97
National Association		
of Cancer Patients		
Robert Headland		p. 105
Melissa Finn		p. 107
Harold Anderson		p. 108

Table of Contents (Continued):

Formal Comment Session:

Sandy Polishek	p. 112
Greg de Bruler	p. 114
Nancy Lou Tracy	p. 119
Cherry Holenstein	p. 121
Bill Cansella	p. 124
Chris Kerchum	p. 125
Matt Kenaga	p. 128
Paige Knight	p. 129
Jim Baldwin	p. 135
Dave Johnson	p. 137
Bruce Frazier	p. 144
Lloyd Marvette	p. 148
Oregon Conservancy Foundation	
Don't Waste Oregon	
Pat Norton	p. 151
Bill Byers	p. 152
Roderick Claremont	p. 155
Art Llewellyn	p. 158
David Hisko	p. 160
Joyce Follingstad	p. 161
Robin Klein	p. 165
Hanford Action of Oregon	
Cindy de Bruler	p. 167
Columbia River United	
Gerry Pollet	p. 174
Heart of America Northwest	
Dirk Dunning	p. 181

Exhibits:

Exhibit No. 1 - Written comments of	
U.S. Senator Slade Gorton	
Exhibit No. 2 - Written comments of	
U.S. Representatives	
Adam Smith and Jim McDermott	
Exhibit No. 3 - Written comments of	
U.S. Representative	
Elizabeth Furse	
Exhibit No. 4 - Written comments of Charlie Hales	
City Commissioner, Portland, OR	
Exhibit No. 5 - Written comments of Mr. Dobbin	
Exhibit No. 6 - Written comments of Ms. Drageaux	
Exhibit No. 7 - Written comments of Ms. Korb	

Table of Contents (Concluded):

Exhibits:

Exhibit No. 8 - Written comments of Mr. Pearsall
Exhibit No. 9 - Written comments of Ms. Aldrich
Exhibit No. 10 - Written comments of Ms. Finn
Exhibit No. 11 - Written comments of Ms. Piippo
Exhibit No. 12 - Written comments of Ms. Tracy
Exhibit No. 13 - Written comments of Ms. Kerchum
Exhibit No. 14 - Written comments of Ms. Knight
Exhibit No. 15 - Written comments of Mr. Llewellyn

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. NORM DYER: Good evening. I'm Norm Dyer, and I wish to welcome you all here tonight, as a member of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board, I am. And this is a very important issue to all Oregonians and all people. And thank you for coming.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Good evening, and thanks for taking time from your evening to be here. I'm Jim Parham, and I'll be your facilitator tonight.

Welcome to this meeting on the U.S. Department of Energy's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Accomplishing Expanded Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the U.S., including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility. And this is programmatic environmental impact statement is also known and referred to as the Nuclear Infrastructure PEIS, and we'll probably – at least I will refer to it as that for the evening, to make the evening a little shorter.

As I said, I'm Jim Parham. I'll be your facilitator tonight. I'm not an employee or representative of the Department of Energy. I've

1 been asked to facilitate this meeting in an open and
2 impartial manner. Glad to be here.

3 Just so you'll know who I am, I
4 actually am a professor at Indiana University, and
5 actually have been out here working for a number of
6 years in the National Park Service, and done a lot
7 of meetings out here. And we'll talk a little bit
8 about that in the format in a little bit. My job is
9 two-fold. I'm here to ensure that you leave here
10 today feeling satisfied that DOE has provided an
11 overview of the proposed action, analyzed in this –
12 to be analyzed in this PEIS, answered your questions
13 to the extent practicable during our question and
14 answer session, and provided you an opportunity to
15 give your comments on the scope of this PEIS.

16 I would ask that you help me make
17 sure that everyone has a chance to comment, to be
18 heard tonight – as you can tell, we have a full
19 room – and this means extending the courtesies to
20 each speaker and commenter that you want when you're
21 up there, too. And it's very important to keep this
22 moving along this evening, because we have so many
23 people who want to talk.

24 This is one in a series of seven
25 scoping meetings to be held on the PEIS. Meetings

1 have already been held down in Oak Ridge, Tennessee,
2 Idaho Falls, last night in Seattle, where we had a
3 good turnout too, of course tonight, and then Hood
4 River and Richland, and then finally, Washington,
5 D.C.

6 The comment period for this began on
7 September 15th, 1999, and is through October 31st,
8 1999. Let me repeat that: the closing date for the
9 comment period is October 31st, 1999. Comments
10 received after that date will be considered to the
11 extent practicable.

12 These hearings are just one way that
13 you can provide information to the Department of
14 Energy on the proposed action and – to be addressed
15 in the PEIS. You can send your written comments the
16 old snail-mail way, you can do e-mail, you can do
17 faxes, voice mail. There's a lot of ways, and
18 there's a fact sheet in your packet about that.

19 When you registered tonight, you
20 should have received a packet of materials that
21 included a comment form. You can return that form
22 to the staff at the registration table or to one of
23 us. And we really appreciate that. There's also a
24 meeting evaluation form, and we'd love to learn how
25 to do these better and better every time, so you can

1 get that form turned back in also at the front desk;
2 that would be helpful.

3 There's also tonight's presentation
4 in that package, and fact sheets related to the
5 project. There's also material in the back of the
6 room from DOE. If you didn't get that information,
7 please step outside – you can get that. I think
8 there's stuff on the back table, too. Other
9 materials available to you – at the desk back there
10 were the expert panel report, "Forecasting Future
11 Demand for Medical Isotopes," the Federal Register
12 Notice of Intent, and several NASA brochures.

13 Now I'll turn to the format of
14 tonight's meeting, and I'll go through a little
15 housekeeping, too. We were approached earlier in
16 the evening, an hour and a half or so ago, by a
17 group who said that they were missing some of the
18 materials from out in front. If you had put up a
19 sign that had this yellow piece of paper –
20 somebody's sign was taken down. It had some logos
21 on it. Specifically, the logo said, "Champs and
22 NWRPCA," and they would love to have their logos
23 back. And I think it was on the R-level next to the
24 restaurant, third floor. So if you had that, that
25 would be wonderful, or if you know where those may

1 have gone to, we'll return those to our colleagues
2 next door in their meeting.

3 Again I'd like to turn to the format
4 for tonight's meeting. Ms. Colette Brown from the
5 Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is
6 here tonight to present an overview of the NEPA
7 process and give a brief presentation on the
8 programmatic environmental impact statement, and
9 that's why – Charlotte here and Sydel over there,
10 they're to do some slides.

11 After that brief presentation, we'll
12 go into a brief question and answer period,
13 clarifying questions on that slide presentation.

14 Then we will move into a period of
15 time when we will take comments, and we'll have two
16 microphones, as you can tell, in the aisle to do
17 that. One of the questions that has come up, is how
18 we will do that. And there is not a sign-in sheet.
19 We, for the last three meetings, and have done so in
20 the past meetings, have a – I select randomly from
21 the audience by a show of hands. And that seems to
22 work very well, because you don't know me and I
23 don't know you, and I just pick people, and then we
24 come up to the microphones. I'd really like for
25 you, if you could – is that we recognize you to

1 come up to the mike. And please don't queue up at
2 the mike, stand up there, because that's a lot of
3 standing for you, and plus, we may take a break, and
4 then you've been standing there five or ten minutes
5 or whatever, and you wouldn't – it would be hard to
6 get a break in. And we'll probably need it, with
7 this – this turnout.

8 I'd also like to introduce, who will
9 be coming up during the question and answer session,
10 Shane Johnson, Special Assistant to the Director of
11 the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and
12 Technology, and is responsible for a lot of this
13 activity. And Shane will be joining Colette up here
14 for the Q&A session, as well as listening to
15 comments.

16 There's other DOE and Richland office
17 and DOE headquarters people here, who will be
18 available to answer questions on – or pertinent
19 questions when they arise. But I won't go through
20 those.

21 As I said, after a brief
22 presentation, I will facilitate the question and
23 answer session, and we'll try to get as many
24 questions answered as possible, although there's no
25 set time. Upon being recognized for your question

1 or for your comments, if you get a chance to give
2 your name and where you're from, it would be great
3 to come up and do that – give me a feel of getting
4 a name for the court reporter who's up here. And by
5 the way, the court reporter will be taking down all
6 the question and answer session as well as the
7 comment section. He may ask for a clarification on
8 a name, and we won't be rude and do that and
9 interrupt you, but we'll make sure we get the name
10 at some point.

11 One of the things that's really
12 important as far as the format tonight, as in the
13 NOI listed, that individuals will given – be given
14 five minutes to comment, and representatives of
15 organizations, ten minutes. And I have someone up
16 here doing a great job for timekeeping for me, and
17 I'll let you know, as least disruptive as I can, you
18 have a minute or thirty seconds to go. And then
19 please finish up at that time, because we'll have a
20 number of people who want to do that.

21 Also, at the first onset we'll
22 recognize any elected officials that are in the
23 audience to provide their comments first, and I
24 don't – I already know there's a few out there,
25 someone's told me, but I'll take that as it comes

1 up. And again, we need to limit our comments,
2 individuals to five minutes, and organizations to
3 ten.

4 I just want to run quickly back
5 through that comment section. When we have it
6 recorded by the court reporter and when we're taking
7 those comments, one thing that would be very, very
8 helpful, if you have a written copy of your
9 comments, we'd love to get that. And if you would
10 bring up here or walk up with it, I'll meet you half
11 way, or Charlotte will be out there to get it. And
12 we'd love to get that copy. We'll turn that into
13 the court reporter, just to validate what he's
14 captured on the tape.

15 One of the questions that, as I said
16 has come up, was about the format we've been using.
17 It's been used in previous meetings, and it's been
18 - I think worked fairly successful. I think last
19 night we went a few minutes past the published
20 closing time of 9:00 o'clock. I think we got out of
21 there about midnight. Just a few minutes past. And
22 it's - blame me if it goes long, I guess. But we
23 have a lot of people who want to comment.

24 So again, I am looking forward to
25 working with you this evening. It's very important

1 that we give – extend the courtesy to the people
2 who are here, who are going to comment. There's a
3 lot of people out here who want to comment, and we
4 really need to hear everyone. We will stay until we
5 see no more hands out here this evening, or they
6 kick us out of the hotel, one of the two. I don't
7 think we're – a twenty-four-hour hotel, right,
8 Charlotte?

9 And if you feel uncomfortable coming
10 up to speak, just let us know, or if a disability
11 doesn't allow you to come to the microphone, we'll
12 bring a microphone to you. And Charlotte – raise
13 your hand, look around – there you go. There's the
14 one that will do that for you.

15 Again, thanks for your attention
16 during this information. And I'd like to now ask
17 Colette Brown to come up and start with our
18 presentation. Colette. And please hold your
19 questions till after their presentation. And it's
20 not that long, so we'll get through it pretty quick.

21 (The presentation by Ms. Colette Brown was given)

22 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks, Colette.

23 If you have – help me out here. If
24 you have some chairs that are next to you that are
25 open, could you just sort of raise your hand for

1 that? Because we have a lot – about forty people
2 in the back of the room. So if you need to take
3 some seats, if – you guys back there, hands high,
4 if you would. If you want to take some seats, it
5 would be great. We're going to be here a long time.
6 If you need a seat – and if you choose to stand,
7 I'll be up there with you.

8 As I said before, the format will be
9 that we will take some questions and answers at this
10 point related to Colette's presentation, and there's
11 – this is not including the five- and ten-minute
12 time limit. I'm looking for brief questions, and
13 we'll get some brief responses, go through some
14 quick questions. A show of hands. We'll both do
15 questions and answers – excuse me; questions, as
16 well as we'll do that with the comments section.
17 I'm waiting while a few people get situated here in
18 their chairs, so we don't disrupt you. And if –
19 there a few more chairs up here. If you need a few,
20 there's at least six or seven seats up here. Thank
21 you for showing your hands; appreciate that. Okay.

22 Okay, so we'll do about ten minutes
23 of questions, and we'll be ready to roll here. Who
24 would like to have a question here? Anybody with a
25 question for Colette? I'm going to go right here to
26 the – yes.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

MR. BILL BYERS: And since there haven't been any new civilian reactors on order since Three Mile Island, and in light of recent nuclear events or occurrences around the world, I would like you to please define for me what is the expanded civilian nuclear energy research and development, and also what are the key civilian nuclear missions.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MR. BILL BYERS: And I must say that I vigorously am opposed to the production of radioactive isotopes being used as a stalking-horse in order -- to support

THE FACILITATOR: We'll take that as a --

MR. BILL BYERS: -- the nuclear industry.

THE FACILITATOR: We'll take that as a comment. Let's get to your questions first. Okay? Go ahead.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: So your question was basically "What are the missions; what are the R&D missions; and what are the key civilian missions that we're talking about?"

1 MR. BILL BYERS: Right, the civilian
2 missions are what I'm primarily interested in right
3 now.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Well, the civilian
6 missions we're talking about are the production of
7 medical and industrial isotopes.

8 We're talking about the production of
9 plutonium-238 fuel required for future NASA space
10 missions. We're talking about a research and
11 development program to test nuclear fuels,
12 proliferation-resistant fuels, materials that may be
13 required, fuels or materials that may be required to
14 validate, for example, a space reactor system that
15 might be needed to go to Mars. I mean, that's just
16 an example.

17 We're talking about accelerated life
18 cycle testing on reactor vessels and other reactor
19 components.

20 Those are the kinds of things we're
21 talking about.

22 MR. BILL BYERS: But it seems to me
23 that --

24 THE FACILITATOR: Let's -- did we get
25 -- there's two parts to that question. I think we
26 got both of them. Is that correct?

1 MR. BILL BYERS: Well –

2 THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead, if you've
3 got one follow-up question. We need to move on. Go
4 ahead. Go ahead.

5 MR. BILL BYERS: Yeah, the – since
6 the nuclear industry in this country seems to be in
7 its waning years, it seems to me that this is really
8 pouring sand down a rat hole, because some of these
9 old reactors now are reaching their effective life,
10 you know, expected life – their life expectancy,
11 and I don't know of any new ones that are being
12 built.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

14 MR. BILL BYERS: And so, you know, it
15 seems to me ludicrous that we're –

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay; what's your
17 question, then? I'm sorry.

18 MR. BILL BYERS: My question is, does
19 – isn't it a waste of money to spend taxpayers'
20 money developing new methods for the civilian
21 reactor industry that is on its last legs?

22 THE FACILITATOR: Take that Colette?
23 Okay, thank you, that's – we're going to move to
24 another question. Go ahead, Colette, and answer
25 that if you would, or –

1 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I think it was a
2 rhetorical question.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, fine.

4 Yes, sir, over there? I cut you off
5 earlier when you were coming up there. Or we'll
6 come over there.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When I look at the
8 options, basically, the alternatives, the four
9 alternatives – and this is a question, but I have
10 to pose it the way I saw it. Alternative 1
11 basically allowed the FFTF – it was a No Action
12 Alternative. And in the No Action Alternative,
13 there was a statement at the bottom that said FFTF
14 would remain in "hot" standby. I'm wondering why
15 there isn't an alternative that's up here that says
16 there is no –

17 THE FACILITATOR: Could you – I hate
18 to interrupt you for a second.

19 *[To attendees holding signs]* I guess
20 you're blocking people's vision here. We can't
21 really block – can you move over to the side,
22 please?

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It says "\$100
24 Million Wasted On FFTF" and it says "Clean Up The
25 Columbia."

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Can you
2 raise them up? I can't do that. There you go.
3 Thank you.

4 Okay, I'm sorry. Please continue
5 with your question. Thank you.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So going back to my
7 question –

8 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We had four
10 alternatives up there, but I think the United States
11 Department of Energy has couched this discussion so
12 they can continue going down the road in production.
13 I don't see an alternative up there that says,
14 "There is no further mission, there is no further
15 production need for Pu-238, there is no – there is
16 no need for FFTF, and therefore, we're going to
17 dismantle our infrastructure." That alternative is
18 not being offered. And I need to understand why,
19 because Alternative 1 says fire – stand-by, no
20 alternative, reactor on standby forever, a decision
21 not to be made till who knows how long, at \$32
22 million a year. And then the other alternatives
23 keep going into production mode, and they get rid of
24 FFTF. Where is the alternative –

25 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: - for nothing to
2 go forward?

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. COLETTE BROWN: The way -

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's the first
6 question.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, let's ask -
8 let's answer the question. That's - that'll be it.
9 We'll move to the next question after that. Thank
10 you. Go ahead.

11 MS. COLETTE BROWN: That's a good
12 question, and it's not apparent in the way we've
13 structured maybe the presentation, that that
14 decision would be allowed to be made. But it is a
15 decision that would be allowed to be made as part of
16 the Record of Decision.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Well, but
18 then here's the problem. What you're doing right
19 now is what I would consider a bait-and-switch
20 operation. You're coming to the American public and
21 you're asking them basically to choose Alternative
22 1, 2, 3, or 4.

23 MS. COLETTE BROWN: No.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, in essence, I
25 mean, this is what they look at. They see

1 Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4. So a person, to
2 make a decision, is looking at Alternative 1, 2,
3 3, and 4. I would suggest that Alternative
4 5 should be up there, and that Alternative 5
5 should say that – no further production missions at
6 all in this country. So that's just a
7 recommendation.

8 And I have one other – one other
9 question.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, let's –
11 that's – I think that's going to – we're going to
12 stop right there.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I – just one
14 other question. It's a qualifying –

15 THE FACILITATOR: No, let's – we're
16 going to take –

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where are the other
18 sites?

19 THE FACILITATOR: No, we're taking
20 other questions. Go ahead and have a seat.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where are the other
22 sites?

23 THE FACILITATOR: Please have a seat.
24 Thank you.

25 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

1 THE FACILITATOR: We're going to –

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where are the other
3 sites, Colette?

4 THE FACILITATOR: Please, we're going
5 to – thank you. Please have a seat.

6 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

7 THE FACILITATOR: We'll get to your
8 questions. You want to take –

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where are the other
10 sites?

11 THE FACILITATOR: You want to take –
12 let's take you here.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're not helping
14 us here.

15 THE FACILITATOR: I'm helping you
16 out; I'm trying to get a lot of people's questions
17 answered. We only took ten minutes to do this.

18 MR. BOB SCHENTER: I have a –

19 THE FACILITATOR: One question; keep
20 it succinct, please.

21 MR. BOB SCHENTER: Do you want my
22 name or –

23 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

24 MR. BOB SCHENTER: Bob Schenter.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Bob.

1 MR. BOB SCHENTER: I have a technical
2 question. On Alternative 3, you define an
3 accelerator-produced – my question is, have – what
4 size, type of accelerator would it be producing
5 neutrons, protons, and large enough to provide the
6 capacity to provide all the missions that you've
7 identified for FFTF?

8 MS. COLETTE BROWN: We're talking
9 about neutrons, a neutron accelerator. And we're in
10 the process right now of developing a reference
11 design that we're going to use to do the analysis of
12 that alternative in this document. And to come up
13 with that design, we're building on existing designs
14 off the shelf, such as the spallation neutron
15 source, such as existing operating accelerators.

16 MR. BOB SCHENTER: Yeah, because
17 standard cyclotrons are strictly proton
18 accelerators. They make medical isotopes, but – so
19 you're envisioning something large, very large, that
20 produces both neutrons and protons for these
21 applications?

22 MS. COLETTE BROWN: To accommodate
23 these missions.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.
25 Okay, I'm going to move to this side of the room; I

1 promised I would. I'm going all the way to the
2 back. A lady – I think a black arm I saw there, or
3 is not there with – thank you.

4 We'll take a couple more questions,
5 then we'll move on to comments. Thanks.

6 MS. ROBIN CASH: My name is Robin
7 Cash. And I understood you to say, "Are we
8 proposing the right things and are we considering
9 the right things?" And I didn't hear any discussion
10 about the cost of cleaning up the waste. As far as
11 I know, we have not discovered any way to
12 effectively clean up the waste. There's no
13 consideration of the huge cost to the environment of
14 cleaning up the waste.

15 I heard you advocate that we need
16 medical isotopes, but there's no discussion about
17 the cost in lives and how much increased cancer, how
18 much increased osteoporosis we're having due to all
19 of this nuclear waste. There's no discussion about
20 how the Superfund money – if we didn't have to have
21 all this Superfund money, how we could have more
22 housing in this community. Affordable housing is a
23 huge, tremendous problem. It is a problem that
24 causes – leads to disease, leads to death, because
25 we don't have enough housing for people. There's –

1 education is a huge problem. We don't have the tax
2 money to have appropriate education, and yet we're
3 spending all this money for the Superfund, and we –
4 and even though we're throwing billions of dollars,
5 we're not cleaning up. This stuff is not being
6 cleaned up. And so when you said, "Are we
7 considering the right things?" –

8 (Applause.)

9 THE FACILITATOR: Can't hear her
10 question; please. I'm sorry, could you –

11 MS. ROBIN CASH: When you said, "Are
12 we considering the right things?" I would say "No."
13 We are not considering the costs to the environment.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Your question?

15 MS. ROBIN CASH: That might cost –
16 my question is "Why?"

17 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

18 MS. ROBIN CASH: "Why?" is – because
19 you know –

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

21 MS. ROBIN CASH: – that many of the
22 people who are here tonight, this is exactly what we
23 want to know.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay.

1 MS. ROBIN CASH: Why is this cost not
2 even discussed?

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.
4 You want to address it?

5 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I think I can
6 answer part of that question. I understand your
7 concerns about cleanup. I don't know how many of
8 you in this room would believe me if I told you that
9 the Department would – remains committed to the
10 cleanup of the Hanford site, with or without this
11 proposal.

12 Now, in terms of the cost of each
13 alternative, we will be preparing and releasing to
14 the public a cost analysis report that analyzes the
15 relative cost of each alternative from cradle to
16 grave. So that will be available to you. In terms
17 of the relative merits of – you know, the relative
18 cost of continued cleanup versus restart of the
19 facility, that is not part of the – at least I had
20 not intended on that being part of the scope of the
21 EIS.

22 MS. ROBIN CASH: The cost to the
23 environment forever. We put these things in
24 dollars, but we don't have dollars to say – for
25 when we destroy the water forever and they don't

1 know how to clean it up, when we destroy the ground
2 forever and they don't know how to clean it up, we
3 don't know how to even cost it. Nobody – I don't
4 believe there's a person in the world that knows how
5 to put a cost on destroying the water and the soil
6 forever.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.
8 We'll move on now. We're going to move to the
9 comments section. The – and will you give me the
10 ten minutes? We'll take one more question here, and
11 then we'll move to the comment period. We have a
12 lot of – let me – before I ask for questions, and
13 I hate to have you put your – how many people are
14 going to want to provide comments for the record
15 tonight here at the microphones? Okay. Are they
16 serving coffee out in the of the back room? I hope
17 so. Okay, that's good. Let's take just one more
18 question, and then we'll move on and get into the
19 comments section. And sir, you've had your hand up
20 diligently there; we'll go to your question.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like to address
22 – you'd spoken about two seemingly commercial
23 applications of this test facility, one to create
24 plutonium-238 for space batteries, the other for
25 medical isotopes. Now, I've heard addressed the

1 issues of creating plutonium-238 for NASA. Now, has
2 NASA turned around and said we need 238?

3 MS. COLETTE BROWN: NASA currently
4 has in its planning stages – is currently
5 considering the use of radioisotope thermoelectric
6 generators that use plutonium-238 for three upcoming
7 missions: 2003 mission, Europa mission; 2004 Pluto-
8 Kuiper Express mission; and 2007 Solar Probe
9 mission. And all of those three missions, in the
10 planning stages right now, are looking at the
11 potential for needing and using Pu-238 power
12 sources.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And now, is – are
14 these uses of the test facility indeed commercial?

15 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I'm sorry?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: To create medical
17 isotopes and also to create this plutonium-238, are
18 these commercial uses of the test facility?

19 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Commercial or
20 civilian?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Commercial.

22 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Those aren't
23 considered commercial uses.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But will –

25 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

1 THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead and let
2 him ask – Finish what – finish your question.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I mean
4 revenue will be generated through these
5 applications, correct?

6 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I'm sorry?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Revenue will be
8 generated through the sale of these applications?

9 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Revenues are
10 generated from sale of medical isotopes, and
11 the Department is working on agreements with NASA on
12 recovering costs for plutonium-238.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you;
14 appreciate it.

15 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I can answer that
16 other facilities question, if you want me to.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead. Yeah,
18 please finish. I'll let Colette finish up.

19 MS. COLETTE BROWN: The lady in the
20 red asked a question about what other facilities,
21 and I think Greg mentioned it first. Let me just
22 respond to that before we move on, because I
23 apparently didn't make it clear in my presentation.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

25 THE FACILITATOR: We are looking at a

1 whole host of other facilities in this EIS. We're
2 looking at the HFIR reactor at Oak Ridge, the ATR
3 reactor in Idaho, the Radiochemical Engineering
4 Development Center in Oak Ridge, to process the
5 neptunium and plutonium. We're looking at the old
6 Fluorinel Dissolution Process Facility in Idaho to
7 do the same processing functions. We're looking at
8 commercial light water reactors. So we are looking
9 at other non-Hanford facilities to accomplish these
10 missions.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [*Indiscernible.*]

12 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We can't –
13 we can't hear the question; you'll have to repeat it
14 for the record.

15 MS. SPRING SWORD: My name is Spring
16 Sword. And I actually at this point – I'd like to
17 ask people what is being spent now for the Hanford
18 cleanup, what will be spent next year and the year
19 after that?

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

21 MS. SPRING SWORD: And the year after
22 that?

23 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, the question
24 is for the –

25 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I got it.

1 THE FACILITATOR: You got it. Okay.

2 MS. COLETTE BROWN: It is my
3 understanding that the Department's 2000 – FY 2000
4 request for cleanup at Hanford, for both cleanup and
5 river protection, is 1.65 billion.

6 MR. GERRY POLLET: It's 1.065; less,
7 1.065.

8 SOUND TECHNICIAN: I'm not picking it
9 up.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I'm going to
11 say – okay, just a second, Gerry.

12 MR. GERRY POLLET: With no inflation
13 increase.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I'm going to
15 ask for –

16 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Okay. Well, as I
17 say, it was my understanding. I didn't say I was
18 right, so thank you.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

20 MS. COLETTE BROWN: So as far as the
21 2001 numbers, I'd have to get back to you. The 2001
22 numbers, I'd have to get back to you on that.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you;
24 appreciate the question.

1 Okay, we're going to go ahead and
2 move into the – okay, move into the comment
3 section session. And we will go with elected
4 officials, starting with the Federal officials
5 first. I know we have senators or representatives
6 of the senators here, so I would ask for a show of
7 hands of the Federal representatives, 'cause I
8 didn't talk to everybody coming in. Obviously, when
9 there's more people, we have someone representing –
10 let's start here, if you would, and then – please
11 tell us who you're representing.

12 **COMMENT SESSION**

13 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SENATOR SLADE GORTON

14 MS. SUZANNE HEASTON: I'm Suzanne
15 Heaston and I represent United States Senator Slade
16 Gorton, Republican from the State of Washington.

17 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

18 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, please, let's
19 go. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to be here
20 very late if we can't show respect here. Please.
21 The same respect for everyone that you're going to
22 want when you're up there. Go ahead, please.

23 MS. SUZANNE HEASTON: "Cardiovascular
24 disease is the number one killer in America. Cancer
25 affects one in three people in the United States.

1 Arthritis and other rheumatic conditions affect 43
2 million Americans – daunting statistics, statistics
3 that are represented by real people and their
4 suffering. Medical isotopes are used in new,
5 cutting-edge technologies in treating cancer and
6 other diseases without the usual debilitating side
7 effects, and at a lower cost than traditional
8 treatments. 'Smart bullets' with medical isotopes
9 have achieved up to 95 percent success in treating
10 certain cancers. However, our nation is facing
11 documented shortages of research and treatment
12 quantities of isotopes because we lack production
13 capabilities. We lack enough facilities to produce
14 the variety, the quantity, and quality of lifesaving
15 isotopes that are necessary to conduct research and
16 treat our patients. In this scoping meeting for the
17 Nuclear Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental
18 Impact Statement, PEIS, I urge the Department of
19 Energy to consider, first and foremost, the
20 commitment the Federal government is required under
21 Section 31 of the Atomic Energy Act to keep: to
22 supply research and production quantities of
23 isotopes.

1 "Isotopes are made and used in
2 various ways, from nuclear waste, as in yttrium-90,
3 which has been found very effective in treating
4 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; accelerator – produced
5 isotopes, such as fluorine-18, used in diagnostic
6 tests like PET scans; and reactor-produced, such as
7 iridium-192, which used" – "which is used to help
8 prevent arteries from reclogging after angioplasty.
9 In assessing our nation's needs, all methods of
10 isotope production to provide a reliable, diverse
11 supply for researchers, and production capabilities
12 for diagnostic and treatment quantities, must be
13 evaluated.

14 "This report should include a
15 thorough critique of projected waste streams from
16 the operation of facilities utilized in meeting our
17 needs. Sound science will accurately inform the
18 public of the type and the quantity of waste
19 generated.

20 The public will thereby have
21 credible information that relies on proven science,
22 instead of out-of-context pseudoscience that is
23 currently disseminated in scare-tactic forms by
24 activist groups.

1 "A detailed cost analysis of how to
2 meet our nation's nuclear infrastructure needs
3 should also be addressed in the PEIS. Funding
4 requirements for the construction of new facilities
5 must be compared to resuming operations at the Fast
6 Flux Test Facility. We have already invested
7 millions in a premier facility that is capable of
8 fulfilling a significant share of our future nuclear
9 infrastructure needs. That investment must not be
10 disregarded.

11 "And finally, any programmatic
12 assessment of our nation's nuclear infrastructure
13 should also include an evaluation of our educational
14 opportunities for training future scientists.
15 Creating a safer and cleaner environment will
16 require highly skilled students of nuclear science
17 and engineering. We must have the facilities such
18 as test reactors for hands-on learning for young
19 researchers. These future scientists are the very
20 people we will rely upon in the 21st century to meet
21 technological challenges such as nonproliferation,
22 fuels development, and spent nuclear fuels.

23 "I appreciate the opportunity to
24 provide these additional suggestions for the scope
25 of the PEIS, to complement the reported scope of

1 evaluating steady-state neutron sources for medical
2 and other isotopes, plutonium-238 for NASA long-term
3 needs, and conventional nuclear research and
4 development needs."

5 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

6 MS. SUZANNE HEASTON: "Most
7 importantly, though, through its isotope program,
8 the Department of Energy has an opportunity to
9 greatly improve the quality of life for millions of
10 Americans who suffer from cancer, cardiovascular,
11 and other diseases. I urge the Department of Energy
12 to recognize and embrace its responsibility to
13 provide the quality and quantity of isotopes needed
14 to diagnose and treat our patients." Thank you.

15 THE FACILITATOR: You have a copy for
16 us? Thank you. Thank you. Okay, thanks. That's
17 it. Thank you.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Boo.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Let's please --
20 come on, let's show some courtesy here.

21 I saw someone else for a congressman
22 or U.S. senator's office. Did I see someone else
23 here from a congressman's office? Yes, sir, in the
24 orange.

1 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE ADAM SMITH

2 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: My name is Dave
3 Johnson, and I've been asked to read a statement by
4 Congressman Adam Smith from Washington, Ninth
5 District:

6 "Hanford has 177 underground tanks
7 containing 55 million gallons of radioactive
8 liquids, sludges, and crusts. Right now, some of
9 these tanks' temperatures are mysteriously rising to
10 dangerous levels, and nearly 70 tanks are leaking
11 highly contaminated waste into the vadose zone near
12 the Columbia River.

13 "The Hanford budget is equally
14 troublesome. We predict the compliance gap between
15 the Tri-Party Agreement and the Department of Energy
16 spending to be nearly \$80 million. Also, the
17 Department of Energy must appropriate \$600 million
18 next year to begin the process to remedy the tank
19 waste problem at Hanford. Restarting the Fast Flux
20 Test Facility will add to the Hanford's
21 environmental and budget woes.

22 "First, the FFTF will send more toxic
23 waste to the underground tanks;

24 "Second, the reactor restart will
25 consume valuable budget dollars that DOE could use
26 to clean up Hanford.

1 "Please terminate the FFTF program
2 and direct the Department of Energy's full attention
3 at the Hanford site to cleanup."

4 Thank you.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Next -- do
6 you have a copy of that? Thank you. Thank you.

7 U.S. Federal representatives --
8 Charlotte, you see -- let's start right here. Is
9 there another one, too, Charlotte? I'm sorry.

10 Okay, go ahead. Federal? No --
11 okay, please come up. Thank you. If you'd state
12 who you're representing -- thank you.

13 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE BRIAN BAIRD
14 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE JIM McDERMOTT

15 MR. GERRY POLLET: U.S.
16 Representatives Jim McDermott and Brian Baird asked
17 that the following be read tonight:

18 "The recent nuclear accident in
19 Tokaimura, Japan, unfortunately hits close to home
20 for many of us in the Northwest. Two-thirds of our
21 nation's high-level nuclear waste lies in the
22 underground storage tanks located at the Hanford
23 Nuclear Reservation. One-third of those tanks have
24 already leaked more than one million gallons of
25 radioactive waste into the soil and groundwater,
26 and corrosion was recently detected in the double-

1 walled tanks. The U.S. Department of Energy, which
2 operates Hanford, has confirmed that leaks from
3 Hanford's high-level nuclear waste tanks may now be
4 heading toward the Columbia River. With this
5 serious environmental and public health threat in
6 mind, we have fought hard in Congress to fund the
7 decontamination and ensure that cleanup remains
8 Hanford's primary mission.

9 "The Department of Energy, however,
10 is currently diverting these critical resources to
11 study the restart of Hanford's Fast Flux Test
12 Facility, FFTF nuclear reactor, to produce plutonium
13 and other isotopes and develop new nuclear fuels.
14 By adding more nuclear waste to Hanford's already
15 leaky and explosive stockpile, a restart of the FFTF
16 is bad public policy that is counterproductive to
17 the cleanup mission, and potentially disastrous for
18 workers and citizens in our region.

19 "Keeping the FFTF on 'hot' standby
20 for the past three years has cost taxpayers \$100
21 million, yet the Department of Energy forecasts that
22 its next budget request to Congress will fall \$232
23 million short of what is needed for the urgent
24 safety and cleanup work required by the Hanford
25 cleanup agreement.

1 "Restarting the FFTF would break the
2 covenant of the Hanford cleanup Tri-Party Agreement
3 between the citizens of Washington state, the
4 Department of Energy, and the Environmental
5 Protection Agency to shut down the FFTF and make
6 cleanup Hanford's sole mission.

7 "At the recent" – "After the recent
8 nuclear accident in Japan and numerous accidents and
9 tank leaks at Hanford, it is unwise, unsafe, and
10 unwarranted to consider an FFTF restart and
11 plutonium production in this region, especially when
12 Hanford lacks any independent nuclear safety
13 regulatory oversight. Our region cannot effectively
14 move forward on the critical Hanford cleanup mission
15 while pursuing the restart of a reactor that will
16 contribute more waste to the nuclear contamination
17 already threatening our region.

18 "Our state's elected officials must
19 unite behind one priority: funding for cleanup in
20 order to prevent an environmental and public health
21 disaster. We cannot do an effective job of cleaning
22 up the problem by simultaneously adding to Hanford's
23 wastes. The funds saved from the shutdown of FFTF
24 must be invested in Hanford's primary cleanup
25 mission, as promised. We urge citizens to voice

1 their concerns about restart of Hanford's FFTF
2 nuclear reactor at U.S. Department of Energy's
3 public hearings this week."

4 Thank you. This was on behalf of
5 Brian Baird and Jim McDermott.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

7 MR. JOHN BOLAND: Point of order.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Just a second.

9 MR. JOHN BOLAND: Point of order.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Your question?

11 MR. JOHN BOLAND: Yes.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir?

13 MR. JOHN BOLAND: We've had two
14 statements from a senator and a member of Congress.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Right.

16 MR. JOHN BOLAND: We don't know what
17 this last statement was. Does Mr. Pollet have in
18 his possession a letter over the signatures of those
19 congressmen authorizing whatever he read?

20 THE FACILITATOR: I just -- I just
21 got a copy of the letter.

22 MR. GERRY POLLET: Are you by
23 yourself? Who is this who asked?

24 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, I'm sorry.
25 The gentleman --

1 MR. JOHN BOLAND: My name is John
2 Boland. I'm just curious, as a point of order –

3 THE FACILITATOR: Right.

4 MR. JOHN BOLAND: – if this – if
5 there's a letter that he has that authorizes the
6 reading of that over their signatures.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't just
8 credit you, Gerry.

9 MR. GERRY POLLET: The Department of
10 Energy can call Congressman McDermott tomorrow
11 morning and they, I think, would find out the
12 answer.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks;
14 appreciate it. Thank you for addressing that.

15 We have additional Federal officials,
16 elected Federal officials representing congressmen
17 or senators?

18 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE

19 ELIZABETH FURSE

20 MS. DE BRULER: Yes. I have a
21 statement from The Honorable Elizabeth Furse. My
22 name is Cindy de Bruler. I'm reading her statement
23 at her request this evening. This is a statement of
24 The Honorable Elizabeth Furse in opposition to the
25 restart of FFTF at Hanford; Portland, Oregon,
26 October 19th, 1999:

1 "As a former member of the Energy
2 Subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives
3 Commerce Committee, I have had considerable
4 experience with the issue of restarting the FFTF
5 reactor at the Hanford facility. It is a dead dog
6 that will not lie down.

7 "Former Secretary of Energy Hazel
8 O'Leary wisely decided not to restart FFTF during
9 her term in office. Unfortunately, she failed to
10 permanently shut down the facility, which is why we
11 are once again facing this question of start-up.
12 Numerous reasons have been given over the years for
13 starting up the FFTF. Each reason has been found
14 flawed, and so a new reason is posited.

15 "Medical isotope production was the
16 popular one during my term on the Commerce
17 Committee. The U.S. Department of Energy is on
18 record that medical isotope production is not
19 sufficient reason for such a costly undertaking, and
20 other facilities already produce the necessary
21 amounts. What are the reasons to support start-up
22 of FFTF? I believe there is only one, the political
23 benefit to certain representatives and senators.
24 What are the reasons to oppose restart of FFTF? I
25 believe there are two.

1 "One, economics. The only guaranteed
2 result from FFTF restart will be the misuse of
3 public funds which will be diverted from cleanup.
4 Congress allocated and appropriated funds to clean
5 up the dangerous waste at Hanford, a danger that
6 potentially affects all people and animals that
7 consume Columbia River salmon spawned below Hanford.
8 Cleanup of existing danger sites at Hanford is
9 already woefully inadequate. Diverting funds from
10 cleanup to restart FFTF will exasperate an already
11 dangerous situation.

12 "Number two, public health.
13 Oregonians and all others living within the region
14 are already at risk from the disgraceful situation
15 at Hanford. The Department of Energy should be
16 ashamed at even thinking about adding additional
17 risk to our citizens' health and safety. Cleanup at
18 Hanford has been slow and ineffective. The waste
19 stream is moving towards the Columbia River, and the
20 danger of explosions at some of the tanks increases.
21 If all efforts are not directed towards cleanup, and
22 soon, there is the likelihood of a disaster
23 happening in the near future. No diversion of
24 effort, focus, or public funds should be considered
25 until the job is done.

1 "The thought of developing more waste
2 is unconscionable, and a violation of the public
3 trust which the Federal government has to its
4 citizens.

5 "Elizabeth Furse."

6 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional
7 Federal representatives, congressmen, or senators?
8 I think that looked like that was it.

9 Moving on to state, the governors'
10 offices, or state legislators, anybody here? Yes.

11 STATEMENT OF STATE SENATOR CHARLES STARR

12 SEN. CHARLES STARR: State Senator
13 Charles Starr.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

15 SEN. CHARLES STARR: I have no
16 prepared statement. In fact, came here without the
17 idea that I would issue a statement. Having family
18 members who have benefitted from radioisotopes helps
19 me to understand how important ongoing research in
20 the use of radioisotopes really is. One of my sons
21 and my younger brother both have had the benefit of
22 the science that is thus far available. We're at
23 the beginning stages of that science, and that
24 certain types of isotopes are in short supply, that
25 there are spot shortages, that this restart could

1 take care of supplying both quantity and quality,
2 would be of tremendous benefit to the citizens of
3 the United States. We are now importing a major
4 share of those isotopes, and I believe that we are
5 vulnerable when we put ourselves in that position.

6 I think that the study should go
7 forward, and I believe the outcome should be the
8 restart of that facility. And so I would urge you
9 to continue with your study and fulfill your mission
10 to provide for medical science those critical tools
11 that they need.

12 And I thank you very much.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay.

14 Any additional state legislators or
15 elected officials? Now let's move on to city and
16 county officials. Do we have commissioners here?
17 Yes, ma'am. Or city mayors or --

18 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF CHARLIE HALES

19 CITY COMMISSIONER, PORTLAND, OREGON

20 MS. JULIANNE DETWILER: Hi. I'm
21 Julianne Detwiler, and I represent city commissioner
22 -- Portland City Commissioner Charlie Hales.

23 Three weeks ago, Commissioner Hales
24 presented to the city council a resolution urging
25 the U.S. DOE to halt efforts to restart FFTF at

1 Hanford until the site is deemed in full compliance
2 with all state and Federal laws, and deemed to be
3 consistent with obligations protecting treaty rights
4 of Native American tribes in the region. And this
5 resolution was unanimously approved by the Portland
6 City Council.

7 Commissioner Hales asked me to share
8 this statement with you tonight:

9 "Portland citizens recognize the
10 serious threat to their health and welfare posed by
11 the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. As the largest
12 city on the Columbia River, we will not ignore this
13 significant issue of local concern.

14 "I call upon the Federal government
15 to meet its obligation to clean up the highly
16 radioactive mess that now pollutes the Hanford site
17 and threatens groundwater and the Columbia River.
18 A serious commitment on the part of the U.S. DOE to
19 fully characterize and clean up the site to the
20 highest regulatory standards is long overdue.
21 That's why any consideration of the restart of the
22 FFTF reactor at Hanford is a dangerous notion.
23 There should be no new waste-producing missions at
24 Hanford for any purpose, period. The scope of the
25 EIS threatens with" – "The inclusion of the FFTF

1 threatens to distract from what should be the sole
2 mission at Hanford, cleanup. That's an unacceptable
3 environmental consequence.

4 "The DOE should abandon its quest for
5 new missions at Hanford, shut down the FFTF reactor
6 once and for all, and proceed as quickly as possible
7 with the full cleanup of our radioactive legacy at
8 Hanford."

9 Thank you.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thanks.

11 Any other city or county officials
12 here? Back here? I'll just go to the guy that's
13 stand- -- city or county officials, elected?

14 MR. DOUG HOUSTON: Governor.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Governor. Okay.
16 Okay, we're back to that. You should have gone with
17 the state. Are you confused?

18 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF JOHN A. KITZHABER

19 GOVERNOR, STATE OF OREGON

20 MR. DOUG HOUSTON: Hi, good evening.
21 I'm Doug Houston. I'm the issue manager for FFTF
22 for the Oregon Office of Energy, and on behalf of
23 the Governor of Oregon, I welcome you all to this
24 meeting tonight.

1 "Cleanup of the Hanford site is one
2 of the top priorities for Oregonians. The Hanford
3 cleanup job is tough, expensive, hazardous, and
4 staff-intensive. Oregon believes distractions from
5 that cleanup must not be allowed. Keeping these
6 things in mind, we cannot support any new missions
7 for FFTF unless the following criteria are
8 satisfied:

9 "There is a compelling need for any
10 new missions;

11 "FFTF represents the best choice for
12 these missions from economic, technical, public
13 health and safety, and environmental safety
14 standpoints;

15 "Operation of FFTF does not
16 compromise Hanford cleanup funding, schedule, or
17 resources;

18 "Operation of FFTF does not
19 significantly increase Hanford's radioactive or
20 hazardous waste burden.

21 "The environmental impact statement
22 must include a detailed examination of DOE's
23 projects for irradiation needs and the rationale for
24 these conclusions. The need for irradiation
25 products has not been documented and is not clear.

1 "We must see a broader selection of
2 options in the EIS, to include restart of other
3 shutdown or standby U.S. DOE facilities. DOE must
4 also examine the potential for use of private sites
5 and modification of existing reactors and
6 accelerators to meet the stated needs.

7 "U.S. DOE must complete" – "must
8 perform a complete examination of the costs of
9 restarting FFTF. The examination must include the
10 cost of restart, operation, shutdown, and
11 decommissioning. Estimates of total life cycle
12 costs must be apparent.

13 "Oregon is particularly concerned
14 about the potential impact of FFTF operation on
15 current and projected Hanford cleanup operations.
16 U.S. DOE must examine the impacts to Hanford cleanup
17 from FFTF wastes, disposition of spent fuel, and the
18 potential diversion of resources from Hanford
19 cleanup to FFTF operation.

20 "We look forward to reviewing an
21 environmental impact statement that includes a
22 complete and thorough examination and evaluation of
23 the points made here, and those contained in our
24 detailed comments which were provided earlier to the
25 Department of Energy. More detailed specific

1 scoping comments have been provided and are included
2 in our letter to the U.S. Department of Energy."

3 Copies of these comments are also
4 available to the public on the tables over here.
5 Thank you.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
7 have a copy of that for me?

8 MR. DOUG HOUSTON: I gave them to
9 this person over here.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

11 I saw one more hand of elected
12 officials. Yes, sir, please.

13 STATEMENT OF KEN DOBBIN

14 CITY COUNCIL MEMBER, WEST RICHLAND, WA

15 MR. KEN DOBBIN: Good evening. Thank
16 you for the opportunity to speak. My name is
17 Councilman Ken Dobbin, City of West Richland,
18 Washington, and our city has adopted the
19 humanitarian mission of supporting the FFTF for
20 medical isotopes production.

21 Our request is that the PEIS include
22 the cost in human lives of not operating the
23 facility. We believe that from the evidence so far,
24 that this facility is needed to reduce the pain,
25 suffering, and death of cancer and other diseases.

1 We believe that that study will show that at least a
2 thousand children and ten thousand adults a year
3 will die with an insufficient supply of medical
4 isotopes.

5 However, before this PEIS scoping
6 hearing began, the City of Portland passed a
7 resolution against startup. And in fact, I have
8 the press release here from Commissioner, City of
9 Portland, Charlie Hales. And in this, in this press
10 release, he indicates that – he demands that the
11 site is cleaned up before any more waste is brought
12 to Hanford. Well, that's interesting. Just a month
13 earlier – just a month earlier, the State of Oregon
14 sent up to our site and buried the Trojan reactor
15 vessel, 250 tons. What hypocrisy. What hypocrisy.

16 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

17 MR. KEN DOBBIN: Yes, would the State
18 of Oregon like it back? I think they should take it
19 back before they put the cost of cleanup on the
20 backs of dying cancer patients.

21 The other thing –

22 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

23 THE FACILITATOR: Please, let's not
24 interrupt. Go ahead.

1 MR. KEN DOBBIN: The other thing that
2 the commissioner said was that if we start up the
3 FFTF, we would steal cleanup money. But just the
4 opposite is true. I know that the Department of
5 Energy, upon shutdown order, would transfer the
6 cost of the facility from nuclear energy back into
7 cleanup. And as the opposition has told you time
8 and time again, this is a zero-sum game. So guess
9 where the cleanup money will come from. It'll come
10 from the waste tanks. So what we have, then, is, by
11 not starting up FFTF, we lose cleanup funds and
12 cancer patients both. What a deal.

13 Yesterday I had the distinct pleasure
14 of addressing the Seattle City Council, and they, as
15 a cooperative gesture, allowed us technical people
16 to go and provide them answers to some of the
17 baloney that the FFTF opponents have been feeding us
18 here in the Northwest.

19 For example, they say that we need no
20 more isotopes. Tell that to the prostate cancer
21 patients in Seattle that have been denied palladium-
22 103 and iodine-125 treatments. Tell that to the
23 people who would benefit from the copper-67
24 monoclonal antibody studies that were halted because
25 of lack of medical isotopes.

1 It also in here says that the – that
2 you would add waste to the Hanford site. However,
3 the FFTF would produce much less than the naval
4 submarines. And year after year, I see naval
5 submarines being transported by huge transport
6 devices and buried in the desert. Again, we don't
7 want to saddle the cleanup of Hanford on the backs
8 of the dying cancer patients. And look at the
9 Trojan reactor vessel. It was buried there.

10 The other absurd statement that's
11 being made is on nuclear safety. I see no one in
12 the opposition who has the technical ability to
13 assess the safety of the FFTF. I have twenty years
14 of physics, reactor safety, and fuel management
15 experience, and the statements being made by the
16 opposition are just flat out false. The containment
17 dome, under the most hypothetical accident, protects
18 the public. Can you say that about your nerve gas
19 stored at Umatilla?

20 I have addressed – I've written
21 Senator Wyden. My city is thirty miles downwind.
22 We are not included in the EIS, which states that if
23 one of those bunkers blows up spontaneously, 10,000
24 people will die. And he won't even return my
25 letter.

26 What I want to challenge tonight is

1

the Portland City Council to give us technical

1 experts, the same consideration as the city of
2 Seattle has. We would like one week to address your
3 technical issues.

4 And my last point, my last point
5 tonight, is that the DOE only has two operating
6 reactors, and that's insufficient capacity. I'm a
7 nuclear engineer. That is insufficient to do all
8 the missions I know needs to be done by the
9 Department of Energy. Therefore, the alternatives
10 will be, spend billions of dollars on new
11 facilities. Guess where that money will come from
12 out of a zero-sum budget? It will come out of
13 Hanford cleanup.

14 So I'm asking you tonight, please
15 seriously consider, for the sake of the children,
16 restarting the FFTF.

17 Thank you.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Do we have a copy
19 of your statement? Mr. Dobbins, do you have a copy
20 for us? Okay, thank you. Thank you. There you go.

21 Okay, any other elected county
22 officials, city officials? I think that pretty much
23 does us up.

24 What we'll do is, we're going to take
25 a — go into the comment period. As I said before,

1 as the NOI stated, we have a five-minute for
2 individuals, ten-minute for representatives of
3 organizations. And as you can see, we have a lot of
4 people who would like to talk tonight, so we'd love
5 for you to keep your comments as brief as possible.
6 If you have written comments, turn them in. And
7 then we also have the opportunity to take your
8 written comments from the forms that are out there
9 tonight. So what we'd like to do is to - I'll
10 acknowledge people by hands, and then we'll move
11 forward. I'm going to take one from each side, and
12 then we're going to take a five-minute break.

13 I needed to point out also, the exit
14 doors are back here; also, the restrooms are to the
15 right. And that was something I failed to do
16 earlier.

17 So let's start and go all the way to
18 the back of this row, in the - yes, ma'am, that's
19 you. Yes. No, no, no; this lady here. I'm sorry;
20 yes. I should have - I thought I said black.
21 Yeah, that's okay, in the very far back. Thank you.
22 Thank you.

23 STATEMENT OF MARNIE LOOMIS

24 MS. MARNIE LOOMIS: Thank you. My
25 name is Marnie Loomis. I'm a student at the

1 National College of Naturopathic Medicine, and a
2 member of Student Physicians for Social
3 Responsibility.

4 And I've heard a lot of arguments
5 from medical reasons and for the people who are
6 suffering, as reasons to reopen this Hanford site.
7 And I want to point out that there are lots of kinds
8 of medicine and lots of things that help people who
9 are sick.

10 It's easy to marginalize us as people
11 who are vicious and want to hurt people, people who
12 don't want to have this Hanford site reopen. But I
13 want to remind people, because maybe people don't
14 know, that all physicians – naturopaths,
15 osteopaths, and medical doctors – all swear to the
16 Hippocratic oath. And within that oath is the
17 statement, "First, do no harm."

18 Now, it's true medical isotopes may
19 help a few people, but it harms so many people and
20 so many things and the Earth, and for a time that we
21 won't even be able to fathom. And I want you to
22 please keep that in mind. So please, don't you dare
23 use medical reasons for opening this up. You're
24 speaking for a group of people who have sworn not to
25 do harm.

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir, please.

3 Thanks.

4 STATEMENT OF MARSHALL GOLDBERG

5 MR. MARSHALL GOLDBERG: Good evening.

6 I'm Dr. Marshall Goldberg. I practice internal
7 medicine in the Portland area, and I'm a specialist
8 in preventive medicine. Unfortunately, what I've
9 heard from DOE this evening is very fishy, more red
10 herrings than "saving salmon."

11 The rationale for the isotope
12 shortage, the expert panel – there seem to be more
13 industry people on the expert panel that recommended
14 additional isotope production facilities in this
15 country than people involved in medical care. I see
16 no public health officials here. I see no
17 practicing physicians here. Where is this
18 compelling need coming from? Again, I just think
19 it's something that's been floated as a need, to
20 resurrect a facility that should have been dead a
21 long time ago.

22 This report of your expert panel
23 states that government involvement in the initial
24 research is essential because the costs are so high.
25 This amounts, again, to a government subsidy.

1 It states at the end here, "The
2 expert panel recommends that the current DOE policy
3 of privatization of all commercially applicable
4 technological developments derived from their
5 programs be incorporated and maintained." So this
6 looks like it is another subsidy to private
7 industry.

8 The nuclear research rationalization.
9 I'd like to just quote from your own document:
10 "Advance the state of U.S. nuclear technology to
11 maintain a competitive position in overseas markets
12 and a future" – "and future domestic markets.
13 Improve performance efficiency, reliability, and
14 economics to enhance nuclear energy application."
15 We don't need more civilian nuclear energy. It's
16 been disastrous enough.

17 I think it's unconscionable that you
18 come here with emotional appeals for pain,
19 suffering, and death. Let us not forget the origins
20 of the Hanford project, from the Manhattan Project:
21 it was to produce weapons of mass destruction and
22 weapons of mass annihilation. In addition to the
23 people it killed in Japan and the people killed in
24 the South Pacific testing these weapons, we have
25 people who have died from exposure to the waste

1 materials and the production efforts in many of our
2 nuclear sites in this country. It's time that this
3 stopped. Enough people, enough of the environment
4 has died. These places are environmental
5 Auschwitzes, and it's time we say we will not
6 forget, and never again for these.

7 I would just like to reiterate that
8 I'd like to see here some people from the medical
9 profession, some people from cancer treatment saying
10 that the isotopes we get from Canada are no good,
11 that the plutonium we get from Russia is somehow not
12 as good as the domestic product.

13 We're hearing red herrings. And
14 Senator Gorton aside, this smells very fishy.

15 Thank you.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

17 Okay, we're going to take a
18 five-minute break and come back. We'll start right
19 here in five minutes; it'll be five minutes. We
20 have our stopwatch on, so --

21 (Recess, 8:23 p.m. until 8:36 p.m.)

22 THE FACILITATOR: Let's go ahead and
23 take our seats. We have a lot of people, want to
24 get right to the comments. Thanks. If we could get
25 you to take a seat, we'd appreciate it. Thanks for

1 your quickness in coming back. Okay. Well, thanks,
2 and I'm checking to make sure the court reporter is
3 up and running. Thank you.

4 We'll go ahead and get started with
5 comments. I'm going to right here, this gentleman
6 on the corner here. Yeah. Sorry? That's right.

7 STATEMENT OF LEN PORTER

8 MR. LEN PORTER: My name is Len
9 Porter. I live in Portland, and I'm a member of
10 Hanford Watch.

11 FFTF is the Monica Lewinsky of
12 Hanford, diverting public attention from the main
13 cleanup issues at Hanford, the leaking tank waste
14 and the spent fuel in the K-Basins, which threaten
15 the Columbia River. Although Oregon has quite
16 clearly said "No" to restarting FFTF in the past,
17 the Department of Energy is back to shove it in our
18 face one more time.

19 The people in the Tri-Cities around
20 Hanford tell us this is about medical isotopes, but
21 it is really about money and jobs for the Tri-Cities
22 and votes for Washington politicians. Oregon, with
23 over one million people downstream from Hanford, has
24 the most to lose by creating more waste there, and
25 nothing to gain. It is deeply offensive to

1 Oregonians to even propose restarting FFTF.

2 Over thirty-five years of operation
3 at one-quarter power, FFTF would generate fifteen
4 tons of spent fuel, dangerous to human and other
5 life for over 10,000 years, our only concrete form
6 of eternal damnation. We have no safe way to
7 dispose of this waste. We may never have a way. It
8 is, therefore, extremely irresponsible to create any
9 more of it.

10 FFTF-pushers say that this fifteen
11 tons is a small amount of waste. Well, small as
12 compared to what? Apparently, compared to the 2100
13 tons of spent fuel in the K-Basins. This is a
14 completely illogical argument. We don't care what
15 fraction it is of what already exists. Because we
16 have – already have huge amounts of spent fuel at
17 Hanford does not mean that more is okay. Whatever
18 fraction it is, it is still fifteen tons of immortal
19 poison. Plus, processing plutonium-238 for space
20 probe batteries would produce more high-level liquid
21 waste to go into the leaking tanks.

22 There is no agreement in the medical
23 field on the future need for medical isotopes. The
24 National Institute of Medicine has said that market
25 demand for medical isotopes is, quote, "speculative,

1 at best," end quote. If more medical isotopes are
2 needed, there are other ways to make them.

3 Dave Johnson, who spoke earlier, a
4 retired nuclear physicist who spent many years at
5 Hanford, told me that a specially designed neutron
6 accelerator could produce a greater variety of
7 medical isotopes than FFTF, at considerably less
8 cost. The design already exists. He says it could
9 be built for 200 million or less.

10 According to Dirk Dunning of the
11 Oregon Office of Energy, the amount of waste
12 generated by such a accelerator, quote, "would be
13 very small compared to a reactor. The nature of the
14 waste would also be different. If it was
15 judiciously designed, the vast majority of what
16 little waste it created could be short-lived
17 nuclides," end quote.

18 As for safety issues, how does the
19 vaporization of Portland strike you? FFTF uses MOX
20 fuel, mixed oxide, a mixture of uranium and
21 plutonium. Hanford has six years of MOX fuel on
22 hand, after which they could import another fourteen
23 years of MOX from Germany. Transportation of MOX
24 fuel is very controversial because of the danger of
25 hijacking by terrorists. MOX fuel is not dangerous

1 to handle, and the plutonium can be easily separated
2 from the uranium. It only – it only takes a few
3 pounds of plutonium, at minimum, to make a bomb.
4 And the making of the bomb is also easy.

5 Remember the shock that went through
6 this country when the Federal building in Oklahoma
7 City was truck-bombed? A nuclear weapon is the
8 ultimate truck bomb.

9 I believe the FFTF issue will be
10 decided by political or legal force. Oregon
11 Representative David Woo has introduced a bill in
12 Congress to cut off funding for FFTF restart in the
13 2001 budget. There are no co-sponsors, and as far
14 as I know, neither of our senators has introduced
15 similar legislation.

16 We need more than statements from the
17 Oregon congressional delegation. We need them to
18 get on board and support Woo's bill. You can tell
19 them so by sending them e-mail from the Hanford
20 Watch Web site, www.hanfordwatch.org.

21 Thank you.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, thank
23 you; appreciate that.

24 Okay, I'll come to this side of the
25 room. Ma'am, right here – yes, sure.

1 STATEMENT OF BARBARA DRAGEAUX

2 WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,

3 PORTLAND BRANCH

4 MS. BARBARA DRAGEAUX: My name is
5 Barbara Drageaux. I'm representing the Portland
6 Branch of Women's International League for Peace and
7 Freedom. I'm expressing opposition of the – the
8 opposition of the members of the Portland Branch of
9 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
10 to the restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility.

11 We insist that the only justifiable
12 expenditure of our tax dollars at the Hanford
13 Nuclear Reservation must be dedicated to the – to
14 cleanup programs. It is a place alive with plants
15 and animals, many of them migratory, capable of
16 spreading the poisons contained in the soil, water,
17 and plants far beyond the boundaries of that
18 560-square-mile area.

19 In considering the environmental
20 impact of the restart of the FFTF, the production of
21 any new radioactive materials, the handling of
22 additional wastes, the transport of toxic materials
23 such as MOX and plutonium-238 to and from the site
24 only increases the threat to all life surrounding
25 Hanford.

1 There is also the threat of all-too-
2 familiar accidents resulting from malfunction or
3 human error. We are not convinced that there is a
4 shortage or unreliable source of medical isotopes,
5 and are convinced that the proposal to meet the need
6 with the FFTF is a convenient ruse to promote
7 nuclear production. We also believe there are other
8 ways of producing electricity for spacecraft.

9 We recognize the economic needs of
10 the citizens of the Tri-City area, and encourage
11 those whose jobs may be in jeopardy from the
12 shutdown of the FFTF to seek work in the
13 decommissioning process, to put their fine minds to
14 work on the complexities of the cleanup process, or
15 to creating a wholesome and clean – as wholesome
16 and clean an environment as possible for their
17 children, grandchildren, and future generations to
18 inherit.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank
20 you ma'am.

21 I'll move over here, the gentleman
22 here in the – yes, sir. Yeah, that's fine. I'll
23 come up here after I come over here. I'm going to
24 move up here to the front rows eventually. Yes,
25 sir.

STATEMENT OF DICK BELSEY

MR. DICK BELSEY: My name is Dick Belsey. I live at 1500 Southwest Fifth Avenue, right here three blocks from this auditorium. I work with a group called Physicians for Social Responsibility, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1985 for a twenty-five-year campaign that said there is no credible medical response to nuclear war. You're looking at disaster on the whole Eastern seaboard because of a natural disaster. And there is an outside and an inside, that we are not affected all the way to the middle of the country.

I hadn't intended to say -- to make any comments today, but listening to the flow, I'd like to share some recollections, particularly about a man named Al Alm, who had a vision that nearly bankrupted and stopped the true cleanup of the Hanford site, along with other sites. The relationship of Hanford on this issue to Portsmouth, where they do the final packaging for the U- -- plutonium-238, is such that the -- Al Alm had made a deal that that site should be cleaned up in ten years, so that they could go to Congress and say, "We've really been doing something." Well, that was going to be the Fast Flux Test Facility, and a new approach to processing.

1 The — let me look at my notes. Oh,
2 yes. It would be important in your — excuse me;
3 I'll leave off there. Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

5 Yes, ma'am, right here. I promise
6 I'm coming to the back there eventually, here.

7 STATEMENT OF NANCY KORB

8 MS. NANCY KORB: My name is Nancy
9 Korb, and I reside in Vancouver, Washington.

10 In the 1970s, my father was one of
11 the plumbers and pipefitters who helped build the
12 Fast Flux Test Facility at Hanford. My father
13 retired in 1986. In 1996, he started showing signs
14 of Alzheimer's disease. He's now confused and very
15 forgetful. However, I am not forgetful.

16 The U.S. Department of Energy entered
17 into the Tri-Party Agreement with the U.S.
18 Environmental Protection Agency and the State of
19 Washington in 1989. The agreement was that Hanford
20 would be cleaned up of its dangerous radioactive
21 wastes.

22 In 1990, then-Washington Governor
23 Booth Gardner appointed me to the Nuclear Waste
24 Advisory Council, upon which I served for three
25 years. The last two years, I was the chairperson of

1 the Transportation Subcommittee. During that time,
2 the council met every other month. We listened to
3 long lectures, to discussions of how highly – of
4 how highly radioactive liquid wastes would be
5 stabilized to stop them from leaking their deadly
6 brew into the ground, and ultimately the ground
7 water to the Columbia River. Every two months we
8 would hear the next chapter of how they were trying
9 to characterize – *i.e.*, find out exactly what mix
10 of radioactive substances were in the tanks, and
11 what to do about them. Many tanks were leaking
12 then, and even more are leaking now.

13 There has been little significant
14 cleanup at Hanford, particularly of the deadly tank
15 wastes. To even consider restart of the Fast Flux
16 Test Facility is insanity, mainly because it would
17 create more high-level radioactive waste. When the
18 promise of cleanup through the Tri-Party Agreement
19 has made so little headway, how can anyone even
20 consider restart of another high-level radioactive
21 waste producer?

22 Some people – some people try to
23 tell us that the FFTF should be restarted to obtain
24 medical isotopes for doing nuclear medicine scans
25 and so on. My education was in radiologic

1 technology, X-ray technology. For over twenty years
2 I taught radiology. Today, in order to have a very
3 up-to-date report, I called two of the largest
4 Portland hospitals, and I was informed by their
5 nuclear medicine departments that they are having no
6 difficulty whatsoever obtaining isotopes. I then
7 called the local supplier of isotopes, who likewise
8 reported no problem at all in obtaining the – in
9 meeting the needs of its customers.

10 We've talked for a little bit, and
11 only talked about the four most commonly used
12 isotopes, and they are iodine-131 and xenon which
13 we obtain from a foreign country, Canada. And
14 thallium-123 and gallium come from St. Louis,
15 Missouri.

16 I haven't forgotten, and each person
17 here should not forget that the U.S. Department of
18 Energy signed an agreement to clean up the high-
19 level radioactive waste at Hanford. We simply
20 cannot allow consideration for creating any more
21 until cleanup is – has taken place, of what's
22 already there.

23 The truth is that the Department of
24 Energy does not know what to do with the liquid tank
25 wastes, and as more single- and/or double-shell

1 tanks begin to leak, more waste is being pushed
2 through the aquifers to the Columbia River. Don't
3 forget, this is no time to start making more high-
4 level waste.

5 The Fast Flux Test Facility must not
6 be restarted.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank
8 you; appreciate it.

9 Yes, sir.

10 STATEMENT OF GAYLORD PEARSALL

11 MR. GAYLOR PEARSALL: Yes; my name is
12 Gaylord Pearsall. I live in northeast Portland.
13 I'm here tonight to protest restarting the Fast Flux
14 reactor at Hanford.

15 The Cold War might be over, but this
16 legacy lives on in our air, in our soil, our water,
17 and our bodies. Hanford Reservation is a mess, for
18 which the Department of Energy is both culpable and
19 responsible. Your only activity there in the future
20 should be to clean it up to the best of your
21 ability.

22 Of special concern are all those
23 leaking tanks which are polluting the groundwater
24 - contrary to your official statements, I believe,
25 in the Columbia River today.

1 Hanford has and continues to poison a
2 large chunk of the Pacific Northwest and its
3 inhabitants. Now you're considering producing
4 plutonium-238, which is hundreds of times more
5 dangerous than the sufficiently lethal plutonium-
6 239. Are you insane? The technical ability to
7 create this substance does not translate to the
8 ability to control or contain it. And it is
9 thoroughly arrogant to believe you can. Accidents
10 have and will continue to happen.

11 For the sake of my descendants and
12 the future of this planet, do not restart the Fast
13 Flux reactor. Stop the insanity now.

14 Thank you.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

16 Okay, I'm going all the – I promised
17 to go all the way to the back here, so you have to
18 walk all the way – the gentleman in the blue shirt
19 here. Yeah, thanks.

20 STATEMENT OF MARK ARIENSO

21 MR. MARK ARIENSO: Yeah, my name is
22 Mark Arienso. I live in north Portland.

23 And earlier someone brought up the
24 idea of an Alternative 5, and I think it's a
25 great idea, and so I propose that the FFTF be

1 permanently deactivated and there be no nuclear
2 research and development and isotope production
3 facility, infrastructure, in the United States.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Just getting
5 a little feedback; it's probably me. The gentleman
6 here in the yellow tie; it's easy to pick out.

7 STATEMENT OF BILL MEADE

8 PUBLIC SAFETY RESOURCES AGENCY

9 MR. BILL MEADE: Hi, can you hear me?
10 Good. My name is Bill Meade, and I'm representing
11 the Public Safety Resources Agency. And this is
12 just verbal comments here.

13 First of all, I want to thank all the
14 Oregonians here tonight. Our voices and written
15 comments need to send a clear message to the
16 Department of Energy that the PEIS needs to consider
17 all issues related to these proposals, instead of
18 simply being limited to an extremely narrow field of
19 study. With respect to Hanford, that means we must
20 address all potential impacts of these operations
21 might have, not merely focus on a single FFTF
22 component of the process.

23 When you look at art, you look at the
24 entire object, not just a single pixel of color.
25 This is how we must approach this PEIS, with an open

1 and inclusive view of all aspects and ramifications,
2 not only of the FFTF, but also of potential fuel and
3 target transportation and fabrication, and also the
4 reprocessing that will be needed to recover the
5 product of the reactor's runs, and the overall
6 health and safety impacts of those individual and
7 integrated component projects and processes.

8 We need to be very clear about this,
9 because the Department of Energy and its contractors
10 have repeatedly demonstrated that they do not
11 understand simple verbal and written comments from
12 people who don't agree with their programs on their
13 fast track. Those of you who monitored the TPA
14 meeting at Hood River a few months ago might be
15 surprised to learn that the Department's contractor
16 stated: "Public opinion favored restarting the
17 FFTF."

18 Anyone — anyone who attended that
19 meeting knows better, but this is how the official
20 record now appears.

21 There are only — there are several
22 reasons for this misrepresentation, but I'll focus
23 on only two of the most prominent concerns.

24 The first major concern is the fact
25 that persons who have vested financial interests in

1 continuing Hanford's production operations, instead
2 of cleaning up their mess, were bused into Hood
3 River, as they were to other hearings, workshops,
4 and national dialogues, and they essentially packed
5 the hearing. I call these aliens "Oregon's three-
6 hour immigrants" because they have been bused in
7 from the Tri-City area of Washington state to spend
8 three hours at Oregon hearings, so they could use
9 our time instead of allowing Oregonians to speak.

10 Many persons who should have really
11 been heard, local families like these folks over
12 here, had to leave the hearing early because –
13 without speaking, because it was a school night and
14 they had to get the kids into bed. I say this to
15 our three-hour immigrants: "Let's hear what
16 Oregonians have to say, and don't try to steal our
17 hearing. Now, we can't do anything about that
18 organized tactic, but we can do better at speaking
19 for ourselves."

20 The second main reason for the
21 Department's failure to accurately report our
22 testimony is that those who oppose a specific
23 project do not use the magic words that must be
24 included in oral or written comments. If you don't
25 include the magic words, your comments are lumped

1 into an "other" category. These comments are
2 essentially discarded, which makes it much easier
3 for the Department of Energy to produce a 1990s
4 version of the Silent Majority to support its
5 programs.

6 Now, my written comments will address
7 specific issues, and I'm sure that other speakers
8 will do that. But there are three points that I
9 want to make about this particular restart of the
10 FFTF reactor.

11 Accelerators versus reactors. One of
12 the overwhelming safety advantages of using an
13 accelerator is the speed at which the process can be
14 stopped in the event of an unforeseen event. This
15 is called accidents. Okay? Unlike nuclear fission
16 reactors, when you shut the electrical power off to
17 an accelerator, the machine immediately stops, the
18 temperature rapidly cools to ambient levels. And in
19 a fission reactor, the residual heat may require
20 several days to reach a level that permits close-up
21 work by emergency personnel.

22 Second is high-level liquid waste.
23 If FFTF if used to produce plutonium for space
24 missions, the project will require a component
25 program to separate and recover the plutonium from

1 the irradiated projects – or targets. This will
2 produce new waste streams of liquid high-level
3 radioactive and chemical waste. These wastes would
4 be added to the current volume of waste that Hanford
5 has been producing for the past fifty-five years,
6 and which have been leaking into the groundwater
7 below the site.

8 I'm almost through. We've got ten
9 minutes; we're an organization. Okay.

10 Any responsible and honest – you
11 want me to go into that? – PEIS should address the
12 effects of reprocessing. But the Department doesn't
13 want to include reprocessing in this PEIS. It
14 considers reprocessing to be a separate action, to
15 be examined sometime in the next millennium.

16 To give you an idea of the magnitude
17 of the wastes that reprocessing could produce,
18 information taken from Hanford's budget data and
19 PNNL studies showed that every pound of plutonium
20 recovered by the Purex plant in 1984 generated
21 approximately 4,138,322 gallons of high-level liquid
22 radioactive waste. In 1984, Purex produced 2,204
23 pounds of plutonium. So no one, and no government
24 agency can responsibly state that these questions
25 should wait until after the reactor begins
26 operations.

1 Incidentally, in addition to that
2 volume of high-level liquid wastes, several other
3 waste streams were created and caused widespread
4 contamination, both on and off the reservation.

5 Last point: an impartial peer review
6 of the Department's findings. This should be a
7 critical component of any process, because the
8 Department of Energy has always failed to keep its
9 promises of working with other agencies and abiding
10 by their agreements. In a 1987 congressional
11 hearing about converting Hanford's WPPSS-1 reactor,
12 the Department and others with vested commercial
13 interests supported an unsafe reactor modification,
14 even though their own internal peer review committee
15 said that it could produce a small nuclear explosion
16 inside the reactor.

17 Written and verbal communications
18 with the Department places Hanford's FFTF as a fast-
19 track option of choice for a production run of
20 another thirty-five years. If you call the PEIS
21 information line, it is the only reactor
22 specifically named, and the dialogue has been
23 carefully structured to financially favor its
24 restart. Based on their past history of

1 manipulation, we simply cannot trust the Department
2 and Tri-Cities to honestly protect Oregon's health
3 and safety.

4 The official comment period closes on
5 October 31st, 1999. Be clear in stating what issues
6 you want the PEIS to address. Send your written
7 comments to the scope of the PEIS directly to the
8 Department. We have their number; I have that
9 information for you if you need it.

10 I have two other points that were –
11 that I think I should address, one about the medical
12 isotopes' farce. Okay. We ratified NAFTA, and so
13 let's take a look at Canadian sources here.
14 Canada's CANDU reactors can produce these materials.
15 Now, I made a research trip in 1998 and spoke with
16 officials at AECL, AECB, and Ontario Hydro. They
17 are very interested in selling irradiation services
18 to the United States, and they are now completing
19 the construction of two reactors specifically
20 designed to produce medical isotopes.

21 Now, the folks next door, the Nuclear
22 Medical – Medicine Research Council, are very
23 knowledgeable about all this information. However,
24 even though they expect an 8 to 17 percent increase
25 in what they need, they don't have a baseline as

1 far as what they need right now. How can you do
2 that? you know, "Oh, yeah, we needed something,"
3 you know, but that's it.

4 One other, final point, and this is
5 about accessibility of our hearings – or meetings,
6 since this isn't a hearing. Some of us live here in
7 Portland, which means we're not going to spend the
8 night at the hotel on an expense account, nor do we
9 have chartered buses to deliver us to the front
10 door. This hotel is not convenient for mass
11 transit, and it doesn't allow for low-cost parking.
12 The last time I had to pay for downtown parking to
13 attend one of your meetings, it cost \$26. It's a
14 good bet that for – the three-hour immigrants who
15 were bused into that meeting from Hanford paid less
16 to try to steal our hearing. Now, the office,
17 Oregon Office of Energy, probably could suggest a
18 better location for future meetings to improve
19 public attendance. Those folks are good at
20 scheduling meetings and are truly open to the
21 public. Now if you fail to do this, it further
22 damages your credibility, and will be another
23 indication that the Department really doesn't want
24 public participation in this process.

1 I have to conform some notes, and
2 then I'll give you a copy.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

4 MR. BILL MEADE: Or I can include it
5 with my written technical analysis.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, whatever
7 you'd like to do on that. Okay.

8 MR. BILL MEADE: I'll send it in.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

10 I'll give our court reporter a chance
11 to catch up there. I'll pick you, sir, since I
12 stepped on your foot earlier as I went out there, so
13 - sorry about that.

14 STATEMENT OF JOHN BOLAND

15 MR. JOHN BOLAND: My name is John
16 Boland. I'm a Tri-Citian. I've lived in the
17 Tri-Cities for almost thirty years. I have to admit
18 I'm in the process of moving to the Vancouver area.

19 I notice that after thirty years in
20 the Tri-Cities, I don't have as much hair as I had
21 when I moved in there. I think it's the nukes.

22 The interesting thing about - I am
23 not one of the "three-hour immigrants" because I am
24 moving to Vancouver. I'm, also, not on an expense
25 account; all of my expenses are paid by me.

1 This meeting is held in southeastern
2 – or in northwestern Oregon, I think with the idea
3 of also serving southeastern Washington. You can
4 almost throw a rock and hit Washington from here. I
5 think the idea was to take testimony from
6 Washingtonians.

7 Just saying something's so over and
8 over and over again doesn't make it so. A number of
9 years ago there was a major nuclear incident at a
10 production facility, I believe, it's a weapons
11 reproduction or nuclear fuel reprocessing plant
12 called Winskill, a long time ago, in Britain. And
13 at that time there were an awful lot of people
14 showed up, anti-nuclear, pro-nuclear type of folks.
15 And they had the foresight in Britain to include in
16 their procedure a blue-ribbon panel of experts –
17 say for instance, people from the National Academy
18 of Science, the National Academy of Engineering on
19 this side – and when somebody made just an
20 emotional statement about the issue, that wasn't
21 particularly examined, but when somebody trotted out
22 some sort of a fact, saying it over and over again,
23 making it more and more of a fact, like "Cleanup
24 funds are going to be taken away from Hanford," they
25 – or they made some other scientific statement,

1 they had to pass muster before this blue-ribbon
2 panel. And a whole lot of them went through some
3 very intense testimony, and decided not to come back
4 for any further examination by these people. I
5 would urge the Department of Energy to incorporate
6 some sort of a scientific panel, again along the
7 lines of the National Academy of Sciences or the
8 National Academy of Engineering, to review the
9 science, pseudoscience, junk science, emotional
10 science sort of statements, sift through them, and
11 publish their findings on those particular things.

12 I would remind people there's a lot
13 of ancient history going on that we in the
14 Tri-Cities are living with, having to do with
15 cleanup. If it weren't for Hanford's contribution
16 to the Manhattan Project, this particular hearing,
17 if it was able to be held at all, the official
18 language might have been Japanese, Chinese, or
19 Russian. We are living with something today that
20 was — it was done as an expediency to end a war.
21 You may disagree with me, and you can have your
22 chance to say it. Now, that was done at the time
23 with an expediency to end a war.

24 We're living with the problems today
25 of nuclear waste up there, and I'm going to tell all

1 of you people, from this three-hour commuter, that
2 this may be your backyard. This river also runs
3 right by my front yard; it's in my front room. And
4 if we perceive anything going sideways up there with
5 the Department of Energy with safety issues,
6 financial issues, lack of cleanup funds, we are the
7 front line of defense. It's going to make it
8 through our front yards and living rooms before it
9 makes it down here.

10 So I suggest that there be some kind
11 of a bond built with the factual and the scientific
12 folks that aren't just involved with nuclear energy
13 and medical isotopes up there. There's lots of
14 folks that can give a lot of other types of
15 information, an alternative view of what's
16 happening.

17 Again, just saying something over and
18 over and over again does not make it a science – a
19 fact, and doesn't make it scientifically defensible.

20 Thank you.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You said science?

22 THE FACILITATOR: Let's – thank you;
23 appreciate it. Thanks.

24 I'm going all the way back here.

25 Comments – come right here, yes. Sure.

STATEMENT OF ANN FRYE

MS. ANN FRYE: My name is Ann Frye. I live in Portland, and I'm a midwife. And as a midwife, I know that in the medical profession there's a huge amount of focus on the detection and the management of problems, health conditions, so forth. And as a midwife, my focus was always on preventing problems. And I think we have to wrench ourselves away from the immediate crisis of the fact that we have so many cancer patients today, and try to prevent a 100 percent cancer rate tomorrow. We have to get a long-term view, and we have to start protecting what's left of our environment. Any support of nuclear energy has to be considered in terms of the long-term.

What are we going to do with the waste? There's nothing to do with it. I didn't hear you present anything about what to do with it. You did say, peripherally, that you were going to start -- you were going to continue to work on cleanup. But how are you going to clean it up? Nobody knows how to clean it up. And we just have to take a long view and work toward a sustainable energy source, which is where the Department of Energy really needs to put its time and effort.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

2 I went to all the way to the back, the
3 lady - I'm going to be very specific - with
4 the brown purse on, that I thought - who got half
5 way here last time; I sent back. So we'll go to her
6 and then -

7 STATEMENT OF SHELLEY SIMONE

8 MS. SHELLEY SIMONE: I really wasn't
9 in the back of the room. Shall I come up here?
10 Thank you.

11 My name is Shelley Simone, and I'm a
12 member of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board, and have
13 been since its inception about thirteen years ago.
14 I'm also co-vice-chair of the Hanford Advisory
15 Board, the site-specific advisory board at Hanford.
16 And I chair the Environmental Restoration Committee,
17 which looks at soil and groundwater contamination
18 on site. I say this tonight, not because I'm
19 speaking on behalf of any of those organizations,
20 but to underscore some of the knowledge that I have
21 and the concerns that I'm carrying with me this
22 evening to this issue.

23 There's tremendous uncertainty on
24 site with what's going on in groundwater and what's
25 going on in the soil, where the waste is, how much
26 there is, and how the heck we're going to contain it

1 and stabilize it. Hanford is the most radioactive

1 site on this continent. We have an obligation, this
2 country does, a moral obligation to clean up the
3 Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

4 If we don't rectify the environmental
5 damage, it will do nothing but damage all of us
6 physically in the future. It will take away the
7 livelihoods of everyone who lives here in the
8 Northwest. I guarantee it.

9 I've seen risk-based decision
10 documents at Hanford that discount our children's
11 lives as a mortgage in the out-years. Is that the
12 intent of the FFTF start-up? Will we see that also?
13 I won't buy it.

14 Senator Smith and Senator Wyden both
15 voted for the ratification of the Test Ban Treaty.
16 I think that Oregon should be very proud, and is
17 very fortunate to have such visionary leaders at the
18 helm. And I think that all of us here tonight need
19 to let them know that we support their efforts and
20 that we need them to support keeping FFTF on a track
21 of decontamination and decommissioning.

22 Our country continues, though, to
23 threaten the stability of the world by refusal to
24 ratify this treaty, and our Congress really bends to
25 the will of what is a rogue military in this

1 country. We've sent depleted -- we've left depleted
2 uranium in Kosovo, we've left it in the Gulf,
3 Persian Gulf. We've poisoned the homeland of people
4 that we're supposedly supporting.

5 I think we've got to keep sight of
6 the prize here in the Northwest, and the prize is
7 cleanup of Hanford. I don't think we can ever
8 retreat from that mission.

9 I think the Northwest has paid its
10 dues to the Cold War cause, and it's a cause that is
11 now bankrupt. I think that we need to focus on
12 stabilization and remediation, and that's it.

13 I want to speak also to the issue of
14 the medical isotopes. It's certainly under debate
15 right now. Three summers ago, when DOE abrogated
16 the TPA milestones for decontamination and cleanup,
17 decommissioning of FFTF, to put it on a standby
18 status. The Oregon Hanford Waste Board asked for
19 an explanation of this decision, and Terry Lash came
20 out from Headquarters in D.C. to field our
21 questions. I asked him quite specifically what
22 DOE's commitment was to medical isotopes, and he
23 very simply said, "None." And I truly believe that
24 that is the issue today: there really is not a
25 commitment to it, and I think that people need to

1 seriously consider what is behind this scoping
2 that's going on at this point for opening up this
3 issue. I think that economically it's a
4 questionable goal, and opening FFTF on the back of
5 that belief is really folly.

6 Our government has told us – has
7 committed to privatization efforts in this country,
8 and I believe that if there are – there is a
9 potential for medical isotopes, that we need to see
10 that happen in a contractual situation. We live in
11 a contractual world. I cannot believe that we
12 cannot look to the private – to private services.
13 We do that in the laundry service, certainly at
14 Hanford, and in privatization of the vent plants and
15 the cleanup of the – of the high-level waste from
16 the tanks.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds or
18 so.

19 MS. SHELLEY SIMONE: Pardon?

20 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds or
21 so.

22 MS. SHELLEY SIMONE: Thirty seconds?

23 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

24 MS. SHELLEY SIMONE: Okay. This PEIS
25 is not comprehensive. It needs to state a mission.

1 Need – clearly, it needs to present other options.
2 And one example is that very one of privatization of
3 production of needed isotopes. I don't see a
4 compelling need for the FFTF's restart.

5 Certainly, the waste disposition is a
6 big one, This waste could not go – the waste that
7 could be generated from the FFTF start-up could not
8 go to the waste isolation pilot plant. It is not
9 eligible for Yucca Mountain. Yucca Mountain is
10 full, if it ever becomes a waste site. It would be
11 a burden to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.
12 Fifteen tons is not insignificant, an insignificant
13 amount. I'll leave it at that.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

15 MS. SHELLEY SIMONE: Thank you.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Going all the way
17 to the back here, so -. Just waiting for my court
18 reporter to try and keep – caught up.

19 STATEMENT OF JENNIFER ALDRICH

20 PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, OREGON CHAPTER

21 MS. JENNIFER ALDRICH: My name is
22 Jennifer Aldrich. I'm representing the Oregon
23 Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility.
24 I'd like to read a resolution that was passed by our
25 national organization that represents over 15,000
26 physicians and concerned citizens nationwide.

1 "Whereas two primary concerns of
2 Physicians for Social Responsibility are long-term
3 public and environmental health, and addressing the
4 Cold War legacy of nuclear weapons production and
5 testing,

6 "And whereas nuclear wastes at the
7 Hanford Nuclear Reservation, generated by nuclear
8 weapons production and comprising two thirds of the
9 nation's burden of high-level nuclear waste,
10 threaten global long-term public and environmental
11 health;

12 "And whereas the Tri-Party Agreement
13 between the Washington State Department of Ecology,
14 the U.S. Department of Energy, and the Environmental
15 Protection Administration makes cleanup, not nuclear
16 weapons or any other production resulting in further
17 contamination, the legal mission of Hanford Nuclear
18 Reservation;

19 "And whereas the Fast Flux Test
20 Facility has been deemed inappropriate for medical
21 isotope production by the Institute of Medicine in
22 its 1995 report 'Isotopes for Medicine and the Life
23 Sciences';

24 "Therefore, be it resolved that
25 Physicians for Social Responsibility opposes the

1 restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility for any
2 production mission, and supports the urgent cleanup
3 mission of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, as a
4 prescription for disaster prevention for generations
5 to come."

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank
7 you. Thanks.

8 Let's go right here, sure.

9 MR. BOB SCHENTER: Can I use the —

10 THE FACILITATOR: No; we're just up
11 here.

12 STATEMENT OF BOB SCHENTER

13 AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY OF EASTERN WASHINGTON

14 MR. BOB SCHENTER: I'm Bob Schenter.
15 I'm representing the American Nuclear Society —

16 THE FACILITATOR [*adjusting*
17 *microphone*]: How's that?

18 MR. BOB SCHENTER: I'm Bob Schenter.
19 I represent the American Nuclear Society of Eastern
20 Washington. And I want to talk about, again, this
21 issue of medical isotope production at FFTF. And
22 it's extremely important.

23 There have been a number of recent
24 advances that I'd like to point out as part of my
25 presentation, and also to request issues that should

1 be addressed in the environmental impact statement.

2 The – what I'd like to show in –
3 recently an article about a young lady – in the
4 recent article in *Good Housekeeping*, April 1999,
5 about a young lady that had non-Hodgkin's lymphoma,
6 treated with yttrium-90. She had a friend that
7 could not be treated because the isotopes were not
8 available. This is in the article of the trial.

9 And

10 so there was a limited amount of the yttrium-90 for
11 this trial.

12 Recently there's been, every year now
13 – in the last three years, in the treatment of
14 heart disease at Scripps in San Diego, in
15 Washington, D.C. programs, over 500 MDs attending,
16 with the – with the recent results in using medical
17 isotopes for the treatment of heart disease. I have
18 here an example of where a study was stopped because
19 of non-availability – or because they could not
20 produce for the treatment of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma,
21 a cancer study was stopped because of the lack of
22 availability of enough isotope. Copper-67 is a
23 different one; it's one they don't produce in
24 Canada.

25 I'd like to make a remark about the
26 comment on Canada. The Canadian reactors are

1 focusing on diagnostic-type isotopes. The size of
2 the reactors are not large enough to produce
3 therapeutic isotopes, which is the wave of the
4 future. Therapeutic isotopes require much larger
5 amounts.

6 And I welcome – I welcome that we
7 interact with the Physicians for Social
8 Responsibility and really find out, is there a
9 shortage of isotopes? We'd love to interact with
10 you and really answer that question. There are a
11 number of physicians in the Seattle area, as I'd
12 mentioned for prostate cancer. They cannot treat
13 prostate cancer with seeds from iodine-125 and
14 palladium-103. There's examples of success in
15 treating non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and many forms of
16 cancer.

17 Finally, I'd like to read a statement
18 from a young lady, Sarah Z., fifteen years old, with
19 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. And the point of this is,
20 we've gone a long way. We need improved medical
21 treatments. She says, quote, "No way do I want to
22 go through chemotherapy again. I want to try the
23 'smart bullet' approach." There's lots of room for
24 improvement in the treatment of these major
25 diseases, cancer, arthritis, and heart disease.

1 Let's - with NEIS, let's join
2 together, Dave and I, let's make - let's find out.
3 Can accelerators produce enough for every hospital
4 in the United States? My hospital in Richland
5 cannot afford a cyclotron; costs too much. We want
6 to be able to produce for every hospital in the
7 United States, make it available, the best
8 treatments for all these diseases. And if medical
9 isotopes are the way to go, then we have to look at
10 that very carefully. That's the importance of the
11 EIS. But let's do it quantitatively. Let's
12 calculate the numbers, find out how many cases we've
13 got to treat, how many isotopes we've got to make,
14 see if Dave's right, see if I'm right. I'd be happy
15 to work with him, or work with any group that's
16 willing to sit down and do the calculations, and not
17 guess at what the answer is. That's part of the
18 purpose of the EIS.

19 Finally, I'd like the Department of
20 Energy to include something that's extremely
21 important, in my mind, was brought up before. And
22 that is, if you shut down this facility, do a
23 calculation of how many lives might be lost. Now,
24 this is not such a hard - in my mind, it's as easy
25 as doing the calculations of a very low-probability

1 accident. We know how many people die of these
2 diseases, we know of the progress, so that should be
3 included in the EIS.

4 Also, the cost savings to the
5 Medicare program. Cancer costs – costs us over
6 \$100 billion. If FFTF can even do a fraction of
7 that or reduce those costs, that's a very important
8 issue.

9 That's all. Thank you.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

11 Right here with the – thanks.

12 STATEMENT OF MARLENE OLIVER

13 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CANCER PATIENTS

14 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: My name is
15 Marlene Oliver. I'm here today representing the
16 National Association of Cancer Patients,
17 representing cancer patients in Portland, Beaverton,
18 Hermiston, Bend, Silverton, Hillsboro, and Salem.
19 The information you are about to hear comes from
20 documentation from the Center for Disease Control
21 in Atlanta, from the American Cancer Society, from
22 the National Institutes of Health, from the National
23 Cancer Institute, from Medicare, from the Health
24 Care Finance Administration, and from published
25 reviewed papers of studies in medical journals.

1 I would like to just do a brief
2 comment initially. I have had over twenty years'
3 experience in the medical field. My specialty is
4 introducing new medical technologies to physicians.
5 Most physicians are not aware of what I'm about to
6 tell you; I would say greater than 90 percent.

7 I would also like to preface this
8 statement by asking you, please do not dismiss
9 cancer patients. Over half a million cancer
10 patients die every year; 1,500 every day. This is
11 the equivalent of three fully loaded Boeing 747s
12 crashing to the ground and killing everyone on board
13 every day. This is not an insignificant impact to
14 this country, or to the people of Oregon.

15 And I'm going to share a few stories
16 with you. Three out of four people in this room,
17 three out of four families, will be affected by
18 cancer in one way or another. Nearly one in two men
19 and nearly one in three females will develop cancer.
20 Every hour in this country a child is diagnosed,
21 develops cancer. Please have compassion for these
22 patients.

23 I'm going to start with prostate
24 cancer, since it's been brought up before. Prostate
25 cancer patients, many of them, have a choice. They

1 can either be treated with tiny radioactive seeds
2 implanted into their prostate, or they can have
3 surgery. In the literature, the generally accepted
4 complication rate of patients having prostate
5 surgery to remove their cancer is 50 percent. One
6 of – one of two males will develop either impotence
7 or incontinence.

8 A year and a half ago, George, from
9 right here, had the choice of seed implants or
10 surgery. Surgery requires an average four- to
11 seven-day stay in the hospital, and a painful six-
12 week recovery.

13 Jerry was more fortunate. A year and
14 a half ago, when this treatment became available,
15 the FDA approved it for the general public, he opted
16 to have implant seeds done in a procedure that takes
17 about an hour, and the complication rate is
18 basically boredom. People with surgery don't have
19 that luxury.

20 Just recently, a patient in Seattle
21 wrote that he was denied medical seed implants
22 because of a shortage of palladium-103 and
23 palladium-125 isotopes. These are what is used
24 today to fill these seeds.

25 The results from seed implants and

1 the results from surgery right now are about the
2 same; however, my expertise as a consultant for new
3 medical technologies shows a new implant seed on the
4 horizon that will work better than surgery.

5 George, again from Seattle, e-mailed
6 he was denied this treatment because of a one-year
7 back-order. Good medical manufacturers who supply
8 life-support treatments always have redundancy of
9 supply. In this country, there is not even an
10 initial supply to give some of these isotopes that
11 doctors are asking for.

12 I have in my files, and if the
13 Department of Energy would like it – I know, like I
14 said, most of the doctors are not aware of this – I
15 have a letter from the Radiological Society of North
16 America, which has 30,000 members that deal with
17 medical isotopes and radiation every day,
18 complaining that they cannot get the isotopes they
19 need for research projects or to treat their
20 patients.

21 I'm going to tell you about Lisa, who
22 is thirty years old, she's engaged to be married,
23 and she lives right here in Beaverton, Oregon. She
24 developed bile duct cancer. She could not tolerate
25 chemotherapy, and this treatment was stopped.

1 Recently, she asked Virginia Mason to be included in
2 a study on medical isotopes. Her cancer has still
3 since spread to her ovary and to her liver. When
4 she called Virginia Mason to be enrolled, they told
5 her that the research was stopped because they ran
6 out of money.

7 In a similar trial in Hillsboro,
8 Oregon, for bone cancer pain – and bone cancer
9 occurs in about 30 percent of cancer patients with
10 prostate cancer and breast cancer; cancer moves.
11 This study again was stopped for lack of research
12 spending. The National Association of Cancer
13 Patients asks the Department of Energy to see about
14 making these isotopes available to the medical
15 community at no charge for treating some of our
16 sickest patients.

17 Many of these isotopes are not
18 available, and can only be made in large reactors
19 such as FFTF. I will give you an example. The most
20 common isotopes that doctors use is iodine-131. The
21 iodine-131 that they are getting right now is less
22 than 10 percent pure. The isotope that doctors
23 would like to get is a purified, high-specific
24 activity form that can be made in a reactor such as
25 FFTF.

1 Cancer patients don't care where
2 their medicine comes from. Their families don't
3 care where their medicine comes from. They just
4 want their cancer to be gone. And the goal of the
5 National Association of Cancer Patients is to
6 eliminate the disease the first time.

7 Many questions were brought up as to
8 "How are we going to pay for all this?" Well, I'm
9 going to share some Medicare figures with you.

10 By using just prostate cancer as an
11 example to start, by having just 5 percent of
12 prostate cancer patients implanted instead of going
13 through surgery, Medicare would save a minimum of
14 \$800 million per year, because surgery obviously is
15 much more expensive than doing implant seeds, which
16 takes about an hour.

17 We don't want to leave these men
18 impotent, we don't want to leave them incontinent –
19 or like George says, "I still want to be able to
20 make love to you"; that's what he told his wife.
21 And he said, "And I don't want to wear a diaper the
22 rest of my life." Tom had prostate surgery in 1992,
23 from right here, and he's been wearing a diaper ever
24 since, because these seeds were not widely
25 available.

1 We'll talk about breast cancer.

2 Breast cancer – this gentleman referred to the
3 isotope copper-67. When the Department of Energy
4 cut off the supply of copper-67 by closing the
5 reactor that was producing it, breast cancer
6 patients that were responding to this treatment had
7 to be sent home. And doctors still can't believe
8 they can't get this isotope.

9 To show you about the promise of
10 nuclear medicine, I'm just going to read a statement
11 from one of these researchers on breast cancer. He
12 says – and this is Dr. Mansfield from Philadelphia.
13 He's talking about how isotopes work: "Similar to
14 the seeds used to zap prostate cancer where the
15 tumor was, this gives an immediate close-range hit
16 to any cancer cells that may remain. These implants
17 can mean that the patient can keep her breast and
18 still have the same chances of survival and the same
19 chances of local control as they would with
20 mastectomy. In this country, the majority of women
21 are still having their breasts removed on the basis
22 of all the evidence that we have, that should not be
23 the case."

24 If the study on 10-117M in Hillsboro,
25 Oregon, for patients with advanced bone cancer could

1 be continued by funding this research, Medicare
2 would save, if only half of these patients were
3 affected – but 75 percent of these patients go off
4 their morphine and see their cancer controlled
5 completely or almost completely for a period of one
6 year, with a single injection.

7 The National Association of Cancer
8 Patients is asking the DOE to fund this research,
9 not a few dollars per patient, but several hundred
10 dollars per patient, because it cost in 1993 an
11 average of \$15,000 to care for a dying cancer
12 patient. The National Association of Cancer
13 Patients asks the people in this room to please
14 write to your senators, write to your congressmen.
15 This is a national health emergency. It deserves
16 our full attention and support.

17 Thank you.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Do you have a copy,
19 ma'am of –

20 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: I'll send it in.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

22 And give our court reporter a chance
23 to catch up there. Okay. Yes, sir, here in the
24 blue. I am going to the edges, trust me; I will
25 come to the edges there.

1 STATEMENT OF ROBERT HEADLAND

2 MR. ROBERT HEADLAND: Yeah, my name
3 is Robert Headland, and I live here in Portland,
4 Oregon.

5 In regards to what Bob said and the
6 lady that just got through talking, the flip side of
7 that is, if we clean up what causes the cancer to
8 start with, we won't have that problem.

9 You know, these Superfund sites –
10 we've got plenty of them in Oregon. You know, this
11 is right down here on Front Avenue. You know,
12 there's – and right downtown here there's all kinds
13 of these Superfund sites. Yet just think how many
14 lives we'd save if we would have started twenty
15 years ago, when we knew about these things.

16 You know, I've got friends that have
17 died; I've had two cancer operations. I worked down
18 at Trojan. I worked on the intake at Trojan when
19 St. Helens blew up, cleaning out all the crap that
20 came down the river from Hanford. You know, every
21 lymph gland in my body swelled up; I had big boils,
22 everything. You know, hey, address the issues, the
23 safety problems and health problems of the people
24 that are affected right now.

25 You know, I had a son that had three

1 operations before he died. He worked with me,
2 construction, laying pipeline through these things.
3 I worked through twenty-some sites, you know, and
4 they're all toxic wastes and Superfund sites. Not a
5 damn person told us one thing about what was in the
6 ground, you know, and they knew about it. So hey,
7 clean up Hanford. You wouldn't have the people in
8 eastern Oregon dying of cancer. You wouldn't have
9 all the American Indians, Native Americans dying.
10 You wouldn't have the twenty-six families up there
11 around Hanford that their families have died, and
12 birth defects and stuff. You know, "Better living
13 through chemistry," my ass. You know, huh-uh, no.
14 Let's address the issues and the health deals before
15 we start building any more of these things.

16 Thank you.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Did you
18 have anything you want to hand in, sir? Did you
19 have anything you want to turn in to me?

20 MR. ROBERT HEADLAND: Unless you want
21 to know all the Superfund stuff at Hanford and all
22 the toxic waste.

23 THE FACILITATOR: It's up to you.
24 Thanks. Okay.

25 MR. ROBERT HEADLAND: I have a few

1 medical bills that I'm paying myself.

2 THE FACILITATOR: No, thanks. Okay,
3 thank you.

4 I'm going all the way in the back in
5 the outside row. I assume you don't think I'm too
6 short to see you back here.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In the front or way
8 back in the corner?

9 THE FACILITATOR: I'm moving through;
10 everyone gets to go, sure. Yeah, I'll be back.

11 STATEMENT OF MELISSA FINN

12 MS. MELISSA FINN: My name is Melissa
13 Finn, and I live in Portland. And I just want to go
14 on the record as being adamantly opposed to any
15 alternative that includes the restart of FFTF.

16 I am opposed to the production of
17 plutonium for medical isotopes, for space missions,
18 and for commercial or civilian nuclear production.
19 The danger of producing plutonium is not worth the
20 risk posed to U.S. citizens.

21 I have this picture that appeared in
22 *The Oregonian*. You guys might have seen it. It's
23 of people in full-bodied white suits when the spill
24 occurred in Japan. And if these are the suits that
25 you need to wear in order to be safe if a spill

1 occurs, I want to know if the Department of Energy
2 is going to supply each person along the Columbia
3 River, every man, woman, and child, one of these
4 full-bodied suits in order to stay protected because
5 we're all at risk if something happens. And I'm not
6 willing to take that risk, especially with my tax
7 dollars.

8 And this is all I want to hand in.

9 And I just wanted to go on in saying
10 that I'm adamantly opposed to anything that includes
11 the restart of FFTF.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

13 Additional – the gentleman here in
14 the white.

15 STATEMENT OF HAROLD ANDERSON

16 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: I want to thank
17 DOE for the opportunity and the listening ear. My
18 name is Harold Anderson. I've lived in Richland,
19 Washington, for the last twenty-six years, but I was
20 born and raised in Seattle for twenty-two years,
21 educated from kindergarten through the University of
22 Washington, College of Electrical Engineering.

23 And at – upon my graduation, I
24 received a job offer to work for Westinghouse
25 Hanford Company, and my full career has had – has

1 been related to the Fast Flux Test Facility. And I
2 want to talk – touch on several topics: One is its
3 safety; a second is the economic savings; a third is
4 its ability to test the destruction of long-lived
5 radioactive wastes, or at least the process for
6 destroying it. Third [sic] is the amount of spent
7 fuel waste that will be produced; and last, we've
8 heard from several people already today that it's
9 capable of saving lives through the production of
10 medical isotopes.

11 I grew up in a family in Seattle that
12 was in the funeral business. My dad wanted me to be
13 a medical doctor. I did take some bioengineering
14 courses along with my double-E curriculum. But ever
15 since the sixth grade, when he took a dry cell and a
16 flashlight bulb and a pair of wires and connected a
17 closed circuit and I saw the light go on, I took an
18 interest in electricity instead. In the sixth
19 grade, Ravenna Elementary School, there was a
20 library book called *Building with Electronics* by
21 Harry Zarche, and I read that and learned how to put
22 together a crystal radio set. And lo and behold, it
23 worked, and I wanted to find out more. So that's
24 how I got started in electrical engineering.

25 These people from personnel came to

1 the University of Washington, showed me a cutaway
2 picture of the Fast Flux Test Facility. I didn't
3 really know a whole lot about reactors. As a matter
4 of fact, it was a strange picture for me to look at:
5 a containment vessel, about a one-third pie-shaped
6 piece cut out of it, lots of piping, a reactor
7 vessel. It was really a strange machine, and I was
8 wondering why he wanted me, as an electrical
9 engineer, to go work on it, 'cause all I saw was a
10 lot of mechanical struct- -- or civil structure and
11 piping. But I figured, yeah, there had to be a lot
12 of wires and light bulbs in that, so I figured I
13 would go and try working for them for a couple of
14 years, see what it was like, maybe go back to the
15 most livable city, Seattle, after that. I had a
16 friend from Spokane who said, "Well, if you're going
17 to Tri-Cities, you know it's a desert over there;
18 it's over 100 degrees in the summertime, there's a
19 whole lot of contaminated waste at Hanford," and he
20 basically painted an unpleasant picture, and I
21 really was apprehensive about going there. Well,
22 when I got there, I was able to help do some
23 development testing on some two-story --

24 THE FACILITATOR: One minute.

25 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: -- brand-new

1 stainless steel refueling machines that would sit
2 and rotate in the reactor head. And it turned out
3 to be a very clean experience. I was able to help
4 with start-up testing, ten years of operation. And
5 I found that the reactor was very safe to operate.
6 In fact, I was leading some of the maintenance
7 activities that went on on top of the reactor head
8 while it ran at 400 megawatts, and the radiation was
9 very little above background radiation.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

11 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Okay; thirty
12 seconds, and I guess I better finish my points.
13 That was just to say that it's a safe reactor.

14 I think when we talk about saving \$40
15 million a year, that's short-sighted. We should
16 look at the \$1.5 billion that's been invested over
17 the life of that facility so far. To shut it down
18 is to throw away that much. The —

19 THE FACILITATOR: Ten seconds.

20 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Eliminating
21 long-lived waste is a matter of recycling them
22 through the fast flux of neutrons. That's something
23 I think should be added to the scope.

24 Another thing is, the 400-megawatt
25 operation of the reactor should be added to the

1 scope. Just in case we can help clean up Hanford
2 wastes by – faster, by running it at 400 megawatts.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

4 MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Thank you for
5 the time.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

7 Yeah, we'll get you on here. Okay.

8 STATEMENT OF SANDY POLISHEK

9 MS. SANDY POLISHEK: My name is Sandy
10 Polishek, I live here in Portland, and I want to
11 speak to you tonight as a person who has been
12 treated for cancer.

13 Everyone who needs cancer treatment
14 certainly deserves to get it. But what cancer
15 patients really want is to not have cancer, to have
16 not gotten cancer. I was born before the nuclear
17 industry was, and in my childhood, cancer was a very
18 rare occurrence. You really didn't hear about
19 anyone having it, except old people. You never
20 heard of children or young adults having cancer.
21 The cancer rate has gone up more than 300 percent
22 since the nuclear industry has come into being. And
23 that is not a coincidence. It is not a mystery.

24 You do not have to be a scientist to
25 know that radiation causes cancer. Madame Curie

1 died of cancer, and we all know that, and we know
2 why she died. We know that the people who painted
3 the numbers on clocks to make them luminous, before
4 they understood the dangers of radioactivity, died
5 of cancer. The epidemic of cancer that now reaches
6 more than one in three was only one in ten when I
7 was a child – and as I said before, it was old
8 people. It was cells that had grown old and didn't
9 have the ability that younger cells have, cells that
10 are under sixty, to deal with aberrations in cells.

11 This – the nuclear industry, it's a
12 very smart industry, in that it creates its own
13 customers, in the need for these so-called isotopes.

14 As a former cancer patient, I am much
15 more interested in cancer prevention, and I would
16 ask you to clean up Hanford, to honor your
17 commitment, and not to create any additional waste
18 until there is no waste, zero waste at Hanford.

19 The reason that you have such – had
20 such a large turnout when the hour was early here,
21 larger than Seattle, is because we are downriver
22 from Hanford. We here in Portland know what it is
23 doing to us. We know the river is radioactive. We
24 know the fish in that river are radioactive. And we
25 ask you to, in that PEIS – I guess that's the magic

1 words – I find them flawed, and I want an option to
2 shut it down and speed up the cleanup.

3 Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: We've been going at
5 this another hour and a half now. We're going to
6 take a five-minute break. We're going to change
7 some tapes here, and we'll be right back. Okay?
8 Thanks.

9 (Recess, 9:47 p.m. until 9:53 p.m.)

10 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you for
11 coming back. I'm going to go quickly over here, the
12 gentleman against the wall, and then I'll be over
13 here, and then we're going back quickly. And it is
14 now, I guess – what time do you have there? Five
15 of 10:00, so –

16 STATEMENT OF GREG DE BRULER

17 MR. GREG DE BRULER: Good evening.
18 My name is Greg de Bruler, and I'm just going to
19 talk from Greg de Bruler's perspective; I'm not
20 going to wear anybody's hat. I've worked on Hanford
21 issues for eleven years. I'm not going to go into
22 my background; most people know who I am and what I
23 do.

24 But one thing that I've been very
25 concerned about is this process of this meeting.

1 For the record, I am disgusted. This is a
2 programmatic scoping hearing – or meeting, quote,
3 "meeting." If we use the word "hearing," that means
4 somebody has to listen. I believe that Colette and
5 Shane are listening; how could you not listen?

6 But when it comes down to making a
7 decision on this, it won't be made in this room and
8 it won't be made on the opinions of everybody here.
9 We have people here telling us stories. I could
10 tell you stories. I can tell you about how I sat on
11 the Hanford Health Effects Subcommittee, and I had
12 nuclear engineers and I had the American Nuclear
13 Society say there's no higher incidence of cancer in
14 the Tri-Cities. Well, what are you comparing it
15 with? I could talk about people who have died along
16 the Columbia River. I could talk about people who
17 have fished on the Columbia River and ate so much
18 fish that their children are deformed. I could tell
19 you all sorts of stories, but that's not why I'm
20 here.

21 I'm here because I hope that the
22 Department of Energy is truly going to do something
23 that's right, make a decision. The Secretary of
24 Energy, Bill Richardson, unfortunately made a
25 decision that was a nondecision. He went to you

1 and he said, "Oh, let's study this thing. This is a
2 political hot potato. I've had people from the Nuke
3 Society come in here and twist my arm, and we've got
4 to do something with this reactor, and I just don't
5 know what to do, so I'm going to study it to death."
6 I'm appalled that you're going to spend 8 to 15
7 million dollars studying this thing.

8 I'm appalled at the fact that you're
9 going to tell me that you're going to do, quote, "a
10 quality" – quantifiable, qualitative everything, do
11 all the little things you've got to do to make this
12 thing so valid, and you're going to have it out by
13 the end of next year. It's impossible. If you're
14 doing a programmatic EIS on this, environmental
15 impact statement, you have to consider all the
16 potential effects on all sites of all production of
17 all waste streams.

18 One thing that you can't do in this
19 programmatic EIS, because the homework hasn't been
20 done by the Department of Energy – and I'll go into
21 technical stuff tomorrow night – is, you can't do
22 an assessment of what your current risks are,
23 because you don't know. You don't know. Hanford
24 holds three-quarters of all the radioactivity in
25 this country on one site. We don't know how much

1 waste we have in the vadose zone, and to most
2 people, that's the ground. We don't know how fast
3 the contaminants are traveling. We won't even spend
4 money to do a comprehensive assessment on site.

5 The Department of Energy last year
6 got a proposal from the Tri-Party agencies, and they
7 agreed that they should do a \$50 million, five-year
8 study of all the wastes that are at Hanford, to get
9 a handle on how bad our problem is. We don't know.
10 I want you to do that for every site you're
11 including – every site. You need to do it for INEL
12 and every other production facility that you're
13 using. You need to look at all the comprehensive
14 wastes that you have collectively. You have to look
15 at all the risks. You can't do a programmatic EIS
16 unless you do this properly. You have to know what
17 you've got short-term, and then you have to know
18 what you're going to add to it, and look at the
19 cumulative potential impacts. You have to look at
20 the cost-benefit analysis all the way out, all the
21 way, life cycle costs till the very end of time, as
22 long as these materials remain intrinsically
23 hazardous. You can't do that; but, yet we're here.

24 You're spending 8 to 15 million
25 dollars – I don't know what the real number is, so

1 I just kind of throw it up there. Nobody's given us
2 a number; we've asked. And you're going to do an
3 environmental impact statement that's going to do
4 one thing: you're going to get challenged in a
5 court of law, and you will be in court, and you will
6 lose. So I ask you all, and I ask the Secretary of
7 Energy, to get off it.

8 If you want to cure cancer, do not
9 start up FFTF. If you want to make medical
10 isotopes, please build a brand-new linear
11 accelerator at Hanford, a hundred million bucks, a
12 hundred-fifty million bucks. And if you privatize
13 it, you'd probably get it cheaper than if the
14 government built it – maybe, maybe not. Operate it
15 for maybe \$10 million a year. Build a linear
16 accelerator. Give these people their cancer cure,
17 if that's what they want. But don't start a reactor
18 up at Hanford. Are you kidding? You can't even pay
19 for cleanup.

20 So I'm really appalled at this. And
21 I hope that you come tomorrow to Hood River, and I
22 hope you ask the people who have already spoken,
23 that want to tell their stories about all the sick
24 and dying people, to please not come to Hood River.
25 I'm asking you: please don't come. They don't want

1 to hear you. They've heard you, they've seen you,
2 and they'll be very upset if you come and try to
3 take up their time to speak. These people want to
4 speak; they want to tell you what they think. We
5 aren't trying to not cure cancer, we're trying to
6 clean up the Hanford site.

7 And unfortunately, I have a real
8 skepticism tonight. This programmatic EIS will end
9 up in a lawsuit, and that's unfortunate, because
10 when it does, we all lose. FFTF will then sit on
11 hold for another year, another year, another year,
12 three years will tick by, \$96 million will be spent,
13 and we all lose.

14 Go home. Tell Bill Richardson to get
15 off it.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

17 MR. GREG DE BRULER: We made the
18 decision. Make the decision. Stand back to the
19 Tri-Party Agreement, and do what you know is right.
20 Shut it down, and don't make any more waste.

21 Thanks.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

23 Next we'll go to the -- ma'am, yeah.

24 STATEMENT OF NANCY LOU TRACY

25 MS. NANCY LOU TRACY: I think I

1 should start out by saying that I'm a retired grade
2 school teacher. I care for children. I have five
3 child- -- five grandchildren that I dearly love, and
4 am very much concerned about the century, coming
5 century in which they're going to spend their lives
6 with the hazards that we've left, left for them,
7 that we're unable to clean up. And that's probably
8 the basis for my thinking in this testimony.

9 I think probably you might call it
10 Alternative 6 or something like that. It is time
11 now, at the century's end, to dispel the myth that
12 nuclear power has ever had any reason for coming
13 into existence. Nuclear power is and always has
14 been unsafe, incredibly expensive, with the dirtiest
15 garbage known on earth.

16 A bigger fallacy, which should have
17 stopped development in its tracks, was the claim
18 that nuclear power could be harnessed for peaceful
19 means alone. So we end the century under the threat
20 of nuclear attack, leave future generations a
21 monstrous legacy of lethal garbage for which there
22 may never be a safe, permanent repository. Yet once
23 again, profit-seeking, short-sighted motives call us
24 to attention, to attendance.

25 Let's start being honest with one

1 another. Our experiment with nuclear fission should
2 have ended with the tragedy of Hiroshima and
3 Nagasaki. Instead, the economic tunnel vision of
4 the nuclear power industry and those who would
5 partake of its profits have wantonly compromised the
6 air, the water, and the soil upon which all life
7 depends. How crazy can we get before we say
8 together "No more"?

9 THE FACILITATOR: Ma'am, did you want
10 to turn in a copy of that? Yeah, thanks. Okay.
11 yeah, sure.

12 Ma'am, right here.

13 STATEMENT OF CHERRY HOLENSTEIN

14 MS. CHERRY HOLENSTEIN: My name is
15 Cherry Holenstein, 6141 Southeast Steel.

16 I hear talk tonight about your
17 mission. My mission is to say "No" again to the
18 restart of the FFTF, to clean up the half century of
19 poison created at this place with the strange name
20 of "reservation." Reserving what? Poisons for the
21 next one thousand years? Have we not had enough of
22 these Orwellian programs with their euphemistic
23 names?

24 They're proposed as humanitarian
25 solutions. The opposition's concerns are seen as

1 uncaring and/or uneducated. Neither is true. It is
2 their care and intelligence that has compelled this
3 crowd of people to attend these hearings *ad nauseam*,
4 again and again, to say "No," to say "No" to the
5 waste at Hanford, to say "No" to the start-up of
6 FFTF.

7 A few comments concerning remarks
8 made earlier. Senator Gorton's representative
9 remarked that cardiovascular disease is the number
10 one killer in the U.S. She mentioned that those
11 suffering need cutting-edge technology such as this
12 expanded nuclear energy research. I'd suggest
13 Senator Gorton utilize the studies done on diet; he
14 would find that our emphasis on animal products is
15 the largest contributor to cardiovascular disease.
16 Oregon's own Dr. Virgil Holst has done years of
17 study on this subject. His son died with Hodgkin's
18 disease at the age of forty, and Dr. Virgil Holst is
19 suffering with cancer at present.

20 Colette Brown mentioned cradle-to-
21 grave cleanup. I find that ironic. For years, for
22 years, "cradle to grave" has been a slogan of those
23 here in Oregon trying to get universal health care.
24 And what we have is cradle-to-grave toxic waste. We
25 have toxic waste with no place to go. We have
26 people needing health care with no place to go.

1 And earlier it was mentioned about
2 the cancer, one in three, affecting one in three
3 now. When Nixon was President, it was one in four,
4 one in five. And we seem to be concerned only with
5 how to take care of those cancer patients, and
6 what's missing is what causes it in the first place.
7 Is it only because the treatment has money with it?

8 As for NASA's space missions, I can't
9 – I can't suspend my intelligence long enough to
10 believe these are civilian missions. As the space
11 command says in their slick brochure "Vision for
12 2020," quote, "Control of space is the ability to
13 assure access to space, freedom of operations within
14 the space medium, and an ability to deny others the
15 use of space," end quote. Just as our new world
16 order denies others food and water and their life, I
17 think our space mission is exploitation, not
18 exploration.

19 This scheme tonight is about DOE
20 reopening previously closed production facilities,
21 of a deadly string of labs across the U.S. This is
22 not about human suffering, it is about lies and
23 exploitation. Clean up, close it down, FFTF. Thank
24 you.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank
2 you.

3 Sir, right here, go ahead.

4 STATEMENT OF BILL CANSELLA

5 MR. BILL CANSELLA: I'm Bill Cansella
6 from Portland, Oregon.

7 And this is a scoping hearing, so I
8 want to address the issue of the scope of the
9 environmental impact statement. And Colette's
10 comments at the beginning of the session tonight
11 have me rather concerned, and I'm going to give you
12 one example that came out of her comments, and then
13 look at some other issues that I need – ought to be
14 – that I think need to be taken into account.

15 Colette made an explicit statement
16 that military uses or potential military uses of
17 FFTF are out of bounds for this EIS, and I think
18 that's inappropriate. I think the legitimacy of the
19 environmental impact statement and of the process is
20 called into question when, at the very get go,
21 certain elements are considered out of bounds. So
22 I'm concerned about the fact that the issues are
23 being constrained before the conversation even gets
24 under way.

25 So my idea of what a comprehensive
26 and appropriate and legitimate EIS would look like

1 would be one that considers all possible uses of
2 FFTF. We don't know what presidential
3 administration is going to be in place in years to
4 come. We don't know who's going to be managing the
5 DOE. We don't know what choices might be made. But
6 we can say that any potential operation that this
7 reactor can allow is a possible operation, and the
8 potential environmental impacts of every such
9 operation need to be taken into account.

10 So I think the military issues need
11 to be included, and I think all possible civilian
12 applications, not just the ones that we've talked
13 about tonight, need to be part of the EIS.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Do you have any
15 comments to turn in, sir? You have any hard -
16 okay.

17 Yes, ma'am, over here in the -

18 STATEMENT OF CHRIS KERCHUM

19 MS. CHRIS KERCHUM: Thank you. I'm
20 Chris Kerchum. I'm a homeowner in Portland, Oregon.
21 My address is 343 Southeast 30th Avenue.

22 As a homeowner, I became very
23 concerned about the fact that my home would be
24 unlivable, and that no one would tell me it was
25 unlivable until after all my neighbors died of

1 diseases caused by radiation. I haven't seen much
2 truthfulness come out of Hanford. I've seen an
3 awful lot of lies; I've seen nothing but
4 obfuscation. I don't see any reason to give them
5 permission to build another plant, much less reopen
6 this one. It's old technology. It should be
7 retired, and it should have been retired quite a bit
8 – a long time ago.

9 And to use the excuse of a cancer
10 cure as a reason to open it just is frightful. When
11 people go in for cancer treatment with isotopes or
12 for bone scans or for any other medical use, most of
13 these patients do not follow the proper protocols,
14 they don't drink enough water to flush these
15 minerals out of their system. You are going to be
16 responsible for killing more cancer patients –
17 maybe it'll take longer, but I'm telling you right
18 now, you are going to have a legacy of a population
19 of people who – eventually, epidemiology will catch
20 up and say, "Look, they might have actually lived a
21 little bit longer. Prostate cancer wasn't nearly as
22 bad as not – as having taken these drugs." I'd
23 like to see that everyone here think about that. If
24 you have to go in for prostate cancer treatment, be
25 sure and drink a lot of water. Okay? If you want

1 to end cancer, talk to the people – Food and Drug
2 should make sugar illegal. You should be able to
3 get white flour only under a medical prescription.
4 Those are two major contributors to ill health and
5 malnutrition, and that's what's causing this
6 epidemic. You have a duty here. I want this to be
7 taken seriously.

8 Engineers are not taught to think in
9 terms of the biological uptake. What happens when
10 all these toxic wastes from this treatment plant are
11 released into the atmosphere and into the ground and
12 into the water is that the biological cycle
13 increases the concentration as it goes up the food
14 chain. You start out with algae, you wind up with
15 things like salmon, which are predators and living
16 off of other critters that are concentrating it.
17 People uptake this. You know, you go out and you
18 buy smoked salmon or you have a nice dinner over at
19 Abernathy's – that's what you're eating. You're
20 eating poisons.

21 There's not one of us in here that
22 doesn't have radioactive materials in our bodies
23 from all the fallout. We don't need any more. We
24 need to get this stopped, and we need to get it
25 stopped today. It's not good for us.

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Ma'am,
3 did you have a copy you'd like to leave with us?

4 MS. CHRIS KERCHUM: Oh, yes.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

6 MS. CHRIS KERCHUM: You want me to
7 leave it here or —

8 THE FACILITATOR: No; I'll get it.
9 Or I'll take it. Thanks. Thanks.

10 Sir, right here. Yeah, thanks. Go
11 ahead.

12 STATEMENT OF MATT KENAGA

13 MR. MATT KENAGA: Hi. My name is
14 Matt Kenaga. I live in Portland, within walking
15 distance of the Columbia River. Matt Kenaga,
16 K-e-n-a-g-a.

17 I personally have had radiation
18 therapy. I have — several relatives have died from
19 cancer, one of them my grandmother, who was involved
20 in a class action suit against the — I assume the
21 Department of Energy. It was actually against the
22 Atomic Energy Commission. Her and the others in the
23 class action suit all had cancer from gaseous
24 releases from Hanford. They lived downwind. She
25 died before the class action suit was finalized. I

1 don't personally know the outcome.

2 One of the economic problems that's
3 going to come up with this if Hanford is decided to
4 be re-opened with the FFTF, is the State of Oregon's
5 constitution declares that all water rights in
6 Oregon are controlled by the state, and they're
7 compelled to ensure water quality. I would assume
8 that that would mean that the State of Oregon would
9 be compelled to sue the Federal government to close
10 the facility if it is opened, or at least – at
11 least to prove its safety, which is impossible. So
12 you know, a 95 percent safety, a 98 percent safety,
13 you know, at what point is it enough to satisfy the
14 legal requirements of safety? And that certainly
15 needs to be included in your economic provisions.

16 Thank you.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

18 The lady in the middle aisle here,
19 black – yeah, sure.

20 STATEMENT OF PAIGE KNIGHT

21 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: It won't harm you,
22 but I have a picture. This is – I've been
23 contemplating this site and –

24 THE FACILITATOR: Could – yeah, come
25 to a microphone so we can hear you.

1 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Okay. Oh, thank
2 you. Well, let me – I want to sort of turn it
3 around. Thank you very much.

4 My name is Paige Knight, and I'm with
5 Hanford Watch here in Oregon. Do we have to give
6 any more than that?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, your Social
8 Security number.

9 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Oh, right. Right.
10 Okay, yeah. And my prison number. Okay.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Paige, are you – I
12 just want to – we had someone from Hanford Watch
13 that was –

14 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: No, none of us are
15 speaking as the – we're all just speaking as
16 individuals.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Oh, okay. Thanks.

18 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Yeah, okay. Yeah.
19 So we're doing the five minutes –

20 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

21 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: – so we can move
22 things on.

23 This picture about NASA and
24 radioisotopes and of our wonderful solar system has
25 gotten me really thinking, and I have some very

1 specific comments I will be making. But this is our
2 world, this is our planet, and this is our solar
3 system. And how can we spend the billions of
4 dollars that go into researching the solar system,
5 when we can't clean up the DOE sites around the
6 country, and in particular Hanford.

7 Senator Hatfield has stated several
8 times that Hanford is the major, the primary
9 environmental problem facing the country, and I
10 totally agree with him. I think everybody in this
11 room probably agrees with him.

12 I was listening to other people's
13 comments tonight, and I was captured by Slade
14 Gorton's aide saying that while we're talking about
15 — when we're talking about isotopes, real people
16 with real suffering, and that there's a documented
17 shortage of isotopes. Well, I also want to remind
18 you, as somebody else has tonight, that there's a
19 documented contamination of the citizens of this
20 country and all the other countries, like the Bikini
21 Atolls that we have contaminated with our nuclear
22 expertise and our nuclear games.

23 Somebody else had talked about sound
24 science versus pseudoscience. And environmentalists
25 are all often accused of following pseudoscience,

1 and anybody in the scientific arena that has gone to
2 school in that area is considered a sound scientist
3 – unless, of course, they go against the grain like
4 many nuclear scientists have, and said, "You know,
5 there's something wrong with this picture." So I
6 think we need to be really, really careful when we
7 cast stones like that. No one group has the right
8 answer to any of this.

9 But what we have in common here is a
10 real concern about this incredible land we live in,
11 in the Pacific Northwest. To me, the Columbia River
12 Gorge, which will be devastated if anything bad
13 happens at Hanford, if the worst possible things
14 happen, which it looks like they might if we don't
15 do cleanup – Columbia River Gorge, to me, is the
16 eighth wonder of the world. And I don't want to see
17 this beautiful place contaminated. I don't want to
18 see our economy devastated. I don't want to see all
19 of us die, which is what could happen if we have a
20 major catastrophe. And at Hanford we have the
21 possibility of the two worst catastrophes in the
22 nation, the K-Basins and the tank farms.

23 So with that in mind, I would like to
24 comment real specifically on this PEIS scoping. I
25 think that this scoping is invalid and should be

1 thrown out and started over again, for several
2 reasons.

3 It is focused primarily on the FFTF;
4 therefore, it is not programmatic and it's not
5 comprehensive. The mission needs are not clearly
6 stated; they are vague, at best. The options named
7 are incredibly limited in scope, and in a biased
8 manner, focusing on a specific facility. This is
9 not the purpose of a PEIS.

10 Programmatic assumptions of this PEIS
11 must not favor one alternative, but evaluate, as
12 you've heard from many people tonight, all
13 alternatives all around the country in specific
14 details. Once this has occurred, a separate EIS
15 must follow, analyzing the full scope of
16 environmental and socioeconomic impacts to the
17 region. This includes impacts to the infrastructure
18 at Hanford and other places, but I'm going to focus
19 on Hanford, since that's what you've chosen to do in
20 this very limited scoping.

21 It must include impacts to the
22 infrastructure, impacts to transportation, impacts
23 to waste management, and environmental restoration.
24 It should look at the potential use of the Fuels
25 Material Examination Facility, better known as the

1 FMEF, and any possible use of the aging Hanford
2 tanks for storage of wastes. Diversion of resources
3 from current cleanup should be covered in this,
4 cleanup missions, and the future cost of facilities
5 used in any FFTF missions must be part of the
6 scoping.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

8 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Okay. Separate
9 scopings on the Pu-238 mission and the medical
10 isotope mission must occur, as well as the
11 comprehensive impacts of the use of mixed oxide or
12 MOX fuel: producing it, transporting it, and cost
13 of managing and storing the wastes resultant from
14 MOX production.

15 This PEIS scoping design is sloppy
16 work at best; deceptive and callous disregard for
17 human public health and safety, at worst. This PEIS
18 scoping should go back to the board. It needs to be
19 more broad, and to justify all of the alternatives.

20 Citizens of Oregon call for the shut-
21 down of the FFTF, so that we can give our total
22 focus and our total budget to the cleanup of the
23 most polluted place in the Western Hemisphere.

24 Thank you.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

1 The air conditioner made a noise. Go
2 all the way to the back there, with the gentleman in
3 the rust-colored shirt.

4 STATEMENT OF JIM BALDWIN

5 MR. JIM BALDWIN: My name is Jim
6 Baldwin, and I also am with Hanford Watch; but, I'm
7 speaking as an individual.

8 A lot of people have said a lot of
9 the things I was going to say. One thing that I can
10 say, though, is, if you want some Pu-238 space
11 batteries, I can tell you where you can get a few of
12 them. There's one at the bottom of the Pacific
13 Ocean, if it hasn't broken open yet, and there's one
14 in the Himalaya Mountains which was lost by the CIA
15 in the '60s, and it's somewhere near the headwaters
16 of the Ganges River. So if you need a space
17 battery, maybe you should go dig those up.

18 As far as the scope – what I would
19 like to see in the scoping, everything Paige just
20 said, plus I would like to see a comprehensive
21 environmental impact of the entire production and
22 disposal chain of plutonium-238.

23 And I would also like to see – you
24 mentioned wanting to hear alternatives. I want to
25 see the alternative of – what if the market for

1 these medical isotopes doesn't materialize?

2 I would like to see the alternative
3 for – what if NASA decides that they need either no
4 plutonium-238 or drastically less plutonium-238 than
5 they say, are now saying they need? Because they
6 don't really need anywhere near as much as they are
7 currently claiming.

8 I'd like to see the environment –
9 I'd like to see discussed the environmental impact
10 of plutonium-238 criticality accidents and other
11 accidents related to producing space batteries out
12 of the product, raw product of the reactor.

13 I'd like to see the environmental
14 impact of a coolant vapor explosion within the FFTF,
15 or – and also fuel vapor explosion. There's a book
16 called *Accident Hazards of Nuclear Power Plants* by
17 Richard Webb. And he says that the FFTF in
18 particular could sustain a fuel vapor explosion on
19 the order of one ton of TNT, and that the
20 containment vessel is only designed for 150 to 300
21 pounds. Those are his figures from when the FFTF
22 was still under construction. So if that's still
23 valid information, I'd want that covered.

24 And also I'd like to see the impact
25 of the – using FMEF, if that's going to be used,

1 because right not it's clean, and it was scheduled
2 to just be never used. If you're going to dirty
3 that up, I want to know the cost and the
4 environmental impact of maintaining that, and
5 basically just, as someone else here said, the
6 environmental impact of just creating stuff that
7 lasts forever, and you have no idea how you're going
8 to get rid of it.

9 And I'll mail it in.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Over to this
11 side, sir, here in the orange. Sure.

12 STATEMENT OF DAVE JOHNSON

13 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Well, let me say
14 something first. I had a couple of viewgraphs, and
15 I was told that that was against the rules.

16 THE FACILITATOR: We're not doing
17 viewgraphs.

18 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: And I kind of
19 feel, you know, uncomfortable about that because
20 Colette had a chance to show her viewgraphs.

21 THE FACILITATOR: We're not using
22 viewgraphs.

23 MR. GERRY POLLET: It's part of his
24 testimony, sir.

25 THE FACILITATOR: He can submit them

1 as testimony. Thank you.

2 Now —

3 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: You know, and I
4 think, you know, DOE could probably use this as
5 their —

6 MR. GERRY POLLET: The public has a
7 right. You don't have a rule —

8 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: — their hearing
9 input.

10 MR. GERRY POLLET: I need to point
11 out you don't have a rule saying no viewgraphs.

12 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay. Do you want
13 to sit down? Don't push it too hard.

14 MR. GERRY POLLET: Don't touch me, or
15 I'll have —

16 THE FACILITATOR: I think I do have —

17 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: I think part of
18 the issue is to educate the public —

19 THE FACILITATOR: I think I do —

20 MR. GERRY POLLET: You don't have a
21 rule about viewgraphs.

22 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: — for example,
23 about alternatives to restarting the FFTF.

24 THE FACILITATOR: When — Gerry, when
25 you came —

1 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: And that's what I
2 am —

3 MR. GERRY POLLET: Why can't they
4 have viewgraphs?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He gave you his
6 viewgraphs. DOE has them.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Wait —

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I mean, excuse me;
9 it's testifying — it's comment —

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is this democracy?

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: DOE has them.

12 THE FACILITATOR: What do you want to
13 do?

14 MR. GERRY POLLET: Explain to the
15 rest of the world why you can't have viewgraphs.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Just — please.

17 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Is it plugged in?

18 MR. GERRY POLLET: Can you explain
19 why you —

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is the DOE above
21 everyone?

22 THE FACILITATOR: You got — here,
23 I'll show — I'll put them up here for you.

24 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay, there's the
25 first one.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

2 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: And there's the
3 second one.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Sure. No, I don't
5 care. Here, I'll get it, Gerry.

6 MR. GERRY POLLET: You don't care?

7 THE FACILITATOR: No, I didn't care.
8 I just thought it was in the rules, but that's fine.
9 I'll get it. I'll even focus it. How's that?

10 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you,
11 Jim.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Move it up.

13 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Thanks, Jim.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I'll get it.

15 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: The main point
16 that I want to make is that I think that an
17 accelerator-based neutron source facility is a far
18 better way to make medical isotopes than restarting
19 the FFTF reactor.

20 This viewgraph -

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [*Indiscernible.*]

22 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: What's that?

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Your clock isn't
24 ticking - started ticking.

25 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: That's okay, it

1 doesn't have to be.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBERS: [*Simultaneous*
3 *comments.*]

4 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Oh, what's that?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Don't you want the
6 reactor?

7 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: No.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that the one you
9 want?

10 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Yes. Yeah. Well,
11 the bottom part right now is the one to look at.

12 An accelerator – there are different
13 types of accelerator-based neutron sources. This
14 one that I'm talking about here is an accelerator
15 that accelerates charged particles to very fast
16 velocities and focuses them into a tight beam, and
17 that's what that thing is supposed to show you,
18 going from left to right. In particular, this –
19 the beam of charged particles is deuterons.
20 Deuterons are an isotope of hydrogen. Regular
21 hydrogen has one proton in the nucleus; a deuteron
22 has a proton plus a neutron. It turns out that when
23 a deuteron hits another nuclei – another nucleus,
24 it tends to break up very easily, and the neutron
25 keeps going. So what you do is, you aim this beam

1 at a – pardon me for turning around my back on you,
2 but I want to help. Aim it at a liquid lithium
3 target, where the beam stops, and most of the heat
4 is deposited in there. Sometimes the deuteron hits
5 another nuclei – nucleus, and breaks up, and the
6 neutron keeps going. That's what the top part of
7 that figure, which is a little out of focus – I
8 have this other figure right here that shows the
9 same thing.

10 This is a facility which was designed
11 between 1977 and 1984 at Hanford. The main
12 contractor was Westinghouse Hanford Company. And
13 the accelerator was Los Alamos National Lab.

14 Now let me show you – show the
15 second one. Okay. Well, it's kind of backwards,
16 but it'll do. Yeah, okay. And in the upper left-
17 hand corner you see the beam is coming in from the
18 right and hits the target there, and that big
19 balloon out there is the region where there's a very
20 high neutron flux region. It's comparable to the
21 neutron flux that exists in the FFTF reactor. The
22 same isotopes can be produced in a facility like
23 this as you can produce in the FFTF. But you have
24 the added advantage, in that you can also use the
25 charged particle beam to make isotopes which are

1 different from those that are produced in the FFTF.
2 So you can actually produce a lot more isotopes.

3 Now, one of my jobs when I was
4 working on this project was to measure the isotope
5 production from the accelerator beams. As a matter
6 of fact, I worked for this guy who is sitting over
7 here, Bob Schenter, who talked about isotopes. He's
8 a good guy, you know; he gave me good raises. And
9 I'm surprised that he, you know, wasn't fully -

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

11 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Thirty seconds?

12 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

13 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay. I don't
14 have time to say anything more, except that - let
15 me focus in on a couple of reasons:

16 It costs less to build this facility
17 than restart the FFTF;

18 It costs less to operate this
19 facility than the FFTF, around \$10 million;

20 And there's cost-recovery advantages.
21 The FFTF proposal is saying the first few years they
22 would get, for medical isotopes, around \$10 million
23 a year. That's what it costs to operate this.

24 And so if it's true that medical
25 isotopes -

1 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, ten seconds.
2 Thanks.

3 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay – built up
4 in time, this will operate at a profit, where FFTF
5 runs at a deficit for a number of years.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

7 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Now this turns off.
9 Okay, thanks.

10 Go to this gentleman right here.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The viewer –

12 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, we're getting
13 it. There we go; thanks.

14 STATEMENT OF BRUCE FRAZIER

15 MR. BRUCE FRAZIER: My name is Bruce
16 Frazier, that's spelled F-r-a-z-i-e-r, Post Office
17 Box 82654, Portland, Oregon. I'm here as an
18 individual, and I don't wish to associate myself
19 either with the behavior or the statements of the
20 people who have come before me.

21 I want to thank the Department of
22 Energy for making this forum available for public
23 discussion and their patience in hearing all of
24 this. I want to speak directly to the scoping of
25 the programmatic environmental impact statement.

1 I would first of all note very
2 quickly that Oregon state policy is already on
3 record. I believe the Department has received the
4 joint legislative resolution from the 1997
5 legislature, which indicated that the people of
6 Oregon are unalterably opposed to the further
7 processing of nuclear materials at the Hanford
8 Nuclear Reservation. And there is no carve-out for
9 medical isotopes or any other activity.

10 I would also say in response to those
11 who have brought up the personal sufferings and the
12 medical problems of many individuals, is that they
13 should all get on the side of national health care,
14 they should all get on the side of alleviating those
15 sufferings by promoting and working in Congress,
16 either as elected officials, otherwise, to fund
17 better care for the affected parties.

18 With regard to the scoping, I think
19 that the scoping should address alternatives in
20 terms of other sources of these radioactive
21 materials, including accelerators and including
22 facilities that may not be within the civilian
23 mission of the DOE. And you mentioned a number of
24 sites that are already under consideration, and I
25 feel that sites like the Fermi Lab and some of the

1 contract sites at universities, Lawrence Livermore
2 Radiation Laboratory, should be explored for the
3 production of these particular materials.

4 I think there should be a full
5 examination of the costs and benefits, and that
6 would include the profits to be made. In reading
7 the material, it appeared that, although there was
8 some revenue from the production, present production
9 of these materials, it did not speak to what the
10 actual bottom line was. And I think we need to know
11 that, how profitable this would be for the United
12 States.

13 I think there needs to be a full
14 examination of the need for the radioactive
15 materials in terms of national security and
16 important national interests, as they have been
17 defined by the National Academy of Sciences and by
18 various presidential directives.

19 I would also ask that the radioactive
20 load to be generated in terms of curies as a result
21 of the proposed action be calculated and expressed
22 in the -- in the scope of the programmatic
23 environmental impact statement.

24 I would also ask that there be an
25 examination of assurances from the Department of

1 Energy as to the final end and cleanup of any
2 facilities used in a proposed action, as to, you
3 know, a guarantee as to when that will come to an
4 end, and exactly what they're prepared to do in
5 terms of cleaning up the proposed facilities.

6 I would also urge that, as part of
7 the programmatic environmental impact statement, the
8 scope therein, that we would examine human risk
9 factors involved, in not only the processing and
10 production, but in the ancillary and support
11 activities, which would include transportation to
12 and from the site, and handling of these materials
13 outside the containment building.

14 In that regard, I would point to the
15 experience in Japan and Korea recently, where in
16 spite of high technology and many years' experience
17 in handling these materials, human-factor accidents
18 did occur.

19 I would also examine on a more
20 scientific basis the extent to which the proposed
21 actions would interfere with the primary mission at
22 Hanford of cleanup. And that was stated to be the
23 primary mission in a number of the documents which
24 have been published by the Department.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Twenty seconds.

1 MR. BRUCE FRAZIER: Twenty seconds?

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

3 MR. BRUCE FRAZIER: And finally, I
4 think that the – we should examine the scientific
5 feasibility of reactors versus accelerators, and
6 have some kind of an addendum that would allow us to
7 come to some kind of an overall conclusion as to
8 which is the more effective for producing these kind
9 of materials.

10 Thank you.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.
12 Did you have a comment – or did you have something
13 to hand in, sir?

14 MR. BRUCE FRAZIER: No; I'll submit
15 it.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

17 The gentleman in – yes, sir.

18 STATEMENT OF LLOYD MARVETTE

19 OREGON CONSERVANCY FOUNDATION

20 DON'T WASTE OREGON

21 MR. LLOYD MARVETTE: Is this – yeah,
22 it's working okay. Thank you. My name is Lloyd
23 Marvette. I am here representing myself. The
24 Oregon Conservancy Foundation, which I work for, and
25 Don't Waste Oregon, which I am one of the board of
26 directors of.

1 I don't have any prepared testimony
2 this evening; I came here basically to listen to
3 what everyone else had to say. And after listening
4 to what everyone else has had to say, at least up to
5 now, I find that there's very little of it that's
6 new to this issue. We've basically all heard it
7 before, and you have definitely all heard it before,
8 as representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy.

9 And I do not intend to repeat the
10 concerns that have been specifically addressed by
11 others. Instead, I would like to go to the root of
12 the problems that we face at Hanford.

13 As long as the U.S. Department of
14 Energy is in charge of Hanford cleanup, we are going
15 to face their ongoing contradiction of missions:
16 clean it up, produce more waste, clean it up,
17 produce more waste. I have reached the conclusion
18 that the only way to stop this self-negating
19 nightmare that we continually go through is to
20 simply do two things:

21 One is that there should be no more
22 nuclear missions for Hanford, other than cleanup;

23 And the second one is that we need to
24 take the U.S. Department of Energy out of the
25 business of cleaning up Hanford, and turn it over to

1 a regional entity similar to that in the Northwest
2 Power Planning Council that is operated within our
3 region in addressing the power needs of our region.

4 The Oregon Conservancy Foundation and
5 Don't Waste Oregon believe that this is the
6 preferred alternative to restarting FFTF, and it
7 definitely needs to be fully scoped.

8 From now on, we should settle for
9 nothing less than true accountability. We will not
10 get true accountability by trading off the needs of
11 nuclear medicine for the preservation of the
12 nuclear-industrial complex at Hanford.

13 We will not get true accountability
14 by using radioisotope power systems in space for
15 more unresolved nuclear waste disposal problems on
16 Earth.

17 We will definitely not get true
18 accountability by fooling ourselves, as citizens,
19 into believing that anyone other than the people of
20 the Pacific Northwest should oversee this tragedy
21 which has been placed in our midst.

22 I believe it is time for us to wrest
23 control of our destiny from the hands of those who
24 see their only mission as business as usual, and we,
25 the people, as fools.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

2 Yes. Sorry.

3 STATEMENT OF PAT NORTON

4 MR. PAT NORTON: Hi. My name is Pat
5 Norton. I live in northeast Portland. And I'm not
6 representing a group. I didn't come with any
7 prepared testimony.

8 I've heard a lot of really eloquent
9 speakers speaking on a whole range of topics that
10 are very important, and they've said much that I
11 can't repeat, because they had all the details and
12 the facts in their heads.

13 But I'd like to say that we all came
14 here after hours, after working all day, and we're
15 all thanking the Department of Energy for our time
16 — for their time. I'm not going to thank you;
17 that's what we pay you for. And you have precious
18 few opportunities available to take public comment.

19 And this, I'm not sure will actually
20 get to the Record of Decision. I'm not sure what I
21 should say. I'm not sure if it's ever going to be
22 listened to.

23 And I think that we should take away
24 the responsibility for cleanup from you. You
25 started out in the nuclear industry with two of the

1 most awful, disgusting, irresponsible, and immoral
2 events in the history of the – history of our
3 species, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And
4 you expect us to trust us [sic] after you lie to us
5 again and again and again. And you won't listen to
6 us.

7 Almost all of us in this area are
8 absolutely against what you've done so far and your
9 further plans, and we don't believe you. Is this a
10 democracy? Each one of you in the Department can do
11 something on your own, with your own brain and your
12 own heart. You can listen to us. You call us
13 uneducated and emotional. I think we're very
14 educated. And we certainly are emotional, and
15 there's nothing wrong with that. And if this is a
16 democracy, you – better listen to us because, so
17 far,
18 your own decisions have been, although highly
19 technically trained, very, very unwise and very
20 immoral and very anti-democratic.

21 That's all I have to say.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir.

23 STATEMENT OF BILL BYERS

24 MR. BILL BYERS: My name is Bill
25 Byers, and I live in southeast Portland. And I'm a

1 member of Hanford Watch, though I'm speaking as an
2 individual.

3 And I go back to the time before the
4 nuclear age, and I'm much more fortunate than some
5 of you. I had sixteen years before they dropped the
6 bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and I had sixteen
7 nuclear-free years. No one in this room, or no one
8 in the audience that was here earlier, has been
9 untouched by the advent of the nuclear age.

10 I recall the Atoms for Peace program.
11 They were going to blast a new canal across
12 Nicaragua. They were going to irradiate seeds and
13 produce food in such abundance that we would never
14 have to worry about starvation.

15 Out of the Atoms for Peace program
16 was spawned the nuclear industry as we know it today
17 in the United States – that is, the civilian
18 nuclear industry. And the line between the civilian
19 nuclear industry and the government or military
20 nuclear industry is blurred to the point where it is
21 almost nonexistent.

22 I've listened to the talks, the
23 people speak today, and I've come to the conclusion
24 that this scoping that you're doing now is nothing
25 but a thinly veiled attempt to breathe new life into

1 that dead horse, which is the domestic commercial
2 nuclear industry. Those people whose greed has
3 brought us to this point, their greed is insatiable.
4 We, the taxpayers, don't have enough money to pump
5 into that nuclear industry.

6 As I said earlier, there have been no
7 new reactors on order, or no new reactors built in
8 this country since Three Mile Island. And I hope
9 there are never any more built in this country,
10 regardless of the efforts of the Department of
11 Energy to prop up an industry that has caused so
12 much harm, and has created and generated so much
13 expensive electricity, and waste that we have no
14 place to put.

15 They talk about the repository at
16 Yucca Mountain. Now, there's some serious
17 considerations or concerns about what's going on at
18 Yucca Mountain. Is Yucca Mountain geologically
19 safe?

20 This stuff – you know, or lives are
21 finite, and we're only going to be here on this
22 Earth for a brief period of time, and we're going to
23 have generations to follow us. And we're going to
24 leave them a hell of a legacy of radioactivity and
25 filth to contend with. This stuff has half-lives –

1 much of it has half-lives longer than we have
2 history. Who the hell are we to make these kinds of
3 decisions that are going to be the burden of
4 generations to come – my children and my
5 grandchildren and my great-grandchildren and so on?

6 I think that the arrogance of the
7 Department of Energy and the arrogance of these
8 people that bring this dog-and-pony show up here and
9 attempt to sell us a program that is going to result
10 in further harm and generate further waste, is
11 really unconscionable and reprehensible.

12 You know, I don't wish any of you
13 ill. I wish you all could go home – we'll send you
14 your paychecks. But don't come up here and try to
15 peddle us this program, because it just isn't fit
16 for human consumption.

17 Thank you.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Did you
19 have any written comments you wanted to turn in?
20 Okay, thanks.

21 Back – sure.

22 STATEMENT OF RODERICK CLAREMONT

23 MR. RODERICK CLAREMONT: Good
24 evening. My name is Roderick Claremont, Portland.

25 I'd like to discuss the civilian

1 mission and regulation. A private reactor,
2 privately owned reactor under the same civilian
3 mission – hence, would probably be turned to
4 commercial – would be subject – or in my
5 understanding, would be subject to licensing and
6 regulation by the NRC. But the FFTF, with the same
7 mission, though it be a civilian mission, if you
8 will – according to the PNNL report, will not need
9 licensing, nor will licensing be sought. Why? I
10 saw references made to this lack of licensing and
11 overregulation. It was because it was a test
12 facility.

13 Now, assurances were made to the
14 safety of the FFTF in the same report, because it
15 complied with an approval of the safety regulation
16 plan upon initial start-up. But not only did what
17 happen in Japan – did that not also happen after
18 the safety approval, where changes were made?

19 Additionally, removing such a checks-
20 and-balances system as regulation by the NRC, cloaks
21 the operations of the FFTF from the public. It's
22 been said that weapons-grade plutonium production is
23 not part of the initial start-up. There's no
24 checks-and-balances system. Who's to say? Who's to
25 regulate what will happen in the future? No

1 assurances have been made to the public about these
2 types of things.

3 Additionally, isotope productions –
4 it's been stated here tonight and in research that
5 accelerators are efficient alternate resources for
6 isotope production. Money has been invested in the
7 design of a – of such an accelerator, called the
8 APT. Money's been invested in this and in the
9 aspect of producing medical isotopes. I got this
10 all – all this information was public domain off
11 the Los Alamos Laboratory Web site. You might
12 consider looking at it.

13 Additionally, the production of
14 Pu-238 for space batteries for NASA – in the
15 literature handed out tonight, there's no indication
16 that NASA actually needs this plutonium. The
17 studies were all DOE-sponsored, saying that the
18 projected need for NASA would be, you know, X or Y.
19 That's – it's not concrete enough.

20 With that, I have to say that because
21 of the offered civilian mission, that it's a weak
22 reason to restart the FFTF. And I wanted to go on
23 the record that I do disagree with starting the
24 FFTF. Thank you.

1 THE FACILITATOR [*adjusting*
2 *microphone*]: How's that?

3 STATEMENT OF ART LLEWELLYN

4 MR. ART LLEWELLYN: My name is -- my
5 name is Art Llewellyn. I have lived in Portland for
6 over twenty years, and half of that time, more than
7 half of that time has been spent in the construction
8 industry and in energy conservation programs. So my
9 experience with -- here in Portland, is that
10 conservation is really going to be more of a
11 solution for our future energy needs than finding
12 new sources that would include nuclear energy.

13 I have -- I mean, it's been rewarding
14 for me to know that a house is not only more energy
15 efficient, it's also more comfortable, so there's a
16 lot of people that are also learning this. This has
17 been my career, it's what I've been doing.

18 And I think -- I think that in the
19 scoping study, one of the purposes for the starting
20 up the reactor will be for fuel development for
21 our nuclear power. And as I'm at this point in my
22 life, I'm no longer doing energy conservation, I
23 work in the housing industry. And I think that our
24 other industry needs to apply conservation efforts
25 rather than going and looking for new forms of

1 energy to meet a demand that they're never going to
2 be able to make – meet with nuclear. That's my
3 conclusion, with our energy needs in the future.

4 I have learned that conservation does
5 more than building a bigger furnace to heat the
6 house up. So industry in this country and the world
7 – it's not going to be able to be maintained, our
8 current lifestyle, particularly in transportation-
9 related industry, all the steel for all that and all
10 the raw materials and all that to maintain our
11 industrialized style of living. We're not going to
12 be able to go and say, "Well, if we just go nuclear,
13 we'll have enough energy to maintain what we have."
14 And that's my conclusion, it's not going to be –
15 we're not going to be able to do that.

16 So it's not exactly on the same order
17 of most of the comments you've heard tonight, but I
18 say that the energy – the Department of Energy is
19 going to have to begin to apply and seriously
20 consider conservation rather than looking for new
21 sources, including nuclear, in our future.

22 I think the best argument for
23 restarting the FFTF is its medical isotope
24 generation potential, but I disagree that that's the
25 best facility for the generation of those isotopes.

1 I don't think that's -- so personally, I'm going to
2 disagree with the nuclear industry altogether,
3 including uses for isotopes that could be generated
4 at that facility. I don't believe it's the right or
5 the best place to generate those isotopes at this
6 time.

7 So thank you. Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Could we get your
9 name again? I'm sorry, we didn't -- I didn't catch
10 your name at first. I'm sorry.

11 MR. ART LLEWELLYN: My name is Art
12 Llewellyn.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thanks.

14 Sure. Is that a statement? Okay,
15 thanks.

16 STATEMENT OF DAVID HSKO

17 MR. DAVID HSKO: Good evening. My
18 name is David Hsko, and I live in northeast
19 Portland. I can see the Columbia River from my
20 roof. And I'm not here tonight for myself, I'm here
21 for my dogs. That's why I ditched them all evening
22 to be here, 'cause they are pissed because they
23 can't swim in the Columbia, because I don't let
24 them, 'cause it's contaminated, polluted, toxic,
25 radioactive. They don't swim in it. And

1 they've been in it once above Hanford this last
2 spring. I was fortunate enough to go in as well;
3 it's the only time I've ever been swimming in it.
4 So clean it up, so I can go swimming in it. I know
5 I won't be able to, but at least if you're trying to
6 clean it up, I'll feel better about trying to swim
7 in it. So do something to get my dogs off my case,
8 'cause they can see it when we go on walks, and they
9 can't get in it.

10 So on record, I'm against the FFTF
11 start-up. I'm for cleanup. You can't do both; it
12 doesn't work. You know you can't. If you're going
13 to start starting this up, you know you're not going
14 to be able to focus on cleanup, so just focus on
15 cleanup.

16 Thank you.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

18 Yes.

19 STATEMENT OF JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD

20 MS. JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD: Hello.

21 My name is Joyce Follingstad. I'm a
22 resident of Portland, northeast Portland. And I
23 want it on the record that I say "No" to the
24 start-up of FFTF, and I vote for the immediate and
25 complete decommissioning of the FFTF facility.

1 One of the things that I haven't been
2 hearing about tonight is the earthquake standards of
3 the FFTF. I was up at Hanford this summer, and
4 asked the director that took us through what was the
5 FTTF built for, and he said it was built to
6 withstand a 2.5 earthquake on the Richter scale.

7 The FFTF was built before the current
8 discovery of the offcoast of Oregon and Washington,
9 the plates that are now predicting up to a 9.0
10 earthquake for the Pacific Northwest. Therefore, I
11 think absolutely I'm against opening up FFTF. But
12 if you're even thinking about it, there needs to be
13 a complete study of the overall earthquake hazards
14 for the entire Northwest region that would be
15 affecting this facility.

16 And every single building, of which
17 there are what, hundreds in Hanford? Should – you
18 know, anything that has any radioactive materials in
19 it should be up to current earthquake standards.

20 When I went to Hanford, they handed
21 me a brochure – I mean, a folder with information
22 about Hanford. And on the cover I was appalled to
23 see that it said, "Hanford, Environmental
24 Excellence." This is the most polluted place on
25 Earth. How can we – I mean, who could sleep the

1 night that they thought that one up?

2 We cannot tolerate creating any
3 further nuclear wastes when we have not solved the
4 numerous problems in waste management. To list just
5 a few of the catastrophic events that are happening
6 daily at Hanford, it is the catastrophe that over
7 the years millions, billions of gallons of
8 radioactive waste have been dumped back into the
9 Columbia River and into the soil at Hanford.

10 There are major plumes of strontium-
11 90, carbon tetrachloride, and other contaminants
12 under the ground at Hanford, and we don't know what
13 to do with these. The K-Basins at Hanford are
14 filled with plutonium, and it's questionable whether
15 we will ever be able to completely clean up those
16 messes. Many tanks in Hanford tank farm are
17 leaking, and nuclear wastes are already in the water
18 table, and many more disasters are occurring on a
19 daily basis at Hanford. Let us not start the FFTF
20 and create more waste burden at Hanford.

21 One other issue, as a nurse and
22 psychologist, I attended the International
23 Conference for Behavioral Health last year in
24 Denmark. The keynote speaker was the man that heads
25 the public health for Finland. He spoke of the

1 experiment there in Finland, where they saw great
2 improvements in the reduction of cardiovascular
3 disease, lung cancers and other cancers, by an
4 aggressive public health program to stop smoking and
5 reduce use of fats in the diet. Let's take one
6 year, 32 million, up to 40 million dollars of the
7 standby costs of the FFTF, and let's put it into a
8 massive, aggressive public health program to reduce
9 the factors that contribute to cardiovascular
10 disease and lung cancers. Let's get behind
11 prevention of these diseases.

12 People have spoken of the way that
13 many cancers have happened in this country due to
14 the – you know, the overall contamination of our
15 environment by the nuclear industry. Not only is
16 this a disaster to the health, the physical health
17 of people, but it's a disaster to the emotional and
18 mental health of people. And as a psychologist, I
19 feel there would be tremendous psychological gains
20 in our population if people took a proactive stance
21 in their health care, rather than the victims'
22 stance that often happens when people are scared and
23 when they are dealing with trying to survive
24 cancers.

1 We all know the saying, "Think
2 globally, act locally." We need to envision a world
3 cleaned up from our nuclear mistakes. We need to
4 act locally by keeping the FFTF from restarting and
5 creating more wastes, and by cleaning up Hanford. I
6 would like to live a very long time, and I would
7 like to see a day in the future when we could say,
8 "Hanford, Environmental Excellence."

9 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
10 have a copy of that? Do you have a copy of your
11 statement?

12 MS. JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD: I'll send you
13 one.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

15 Back here, yeah. I'm sorry, you said
16 - thank you. That was - thank you.

17 STATEMENT OF ROBIN KLEIN

18 HANFORD ACTION OF OREGON

19 MS. ROBIN KLEIN: Hello.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Oh, I'm sorry; we
21 just wanted to get her last name.

22 MS. JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD: Follingstad.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Follingstad
24 Follingstad. Thank you.

25 MS. ROBIN KLEIN: Yes. My name is

1 Robin Klein. I'm with Hanford Action of Oregon.

2 I'd like to -- what I'd really like
3 to do is promote a novel idea. Instead of inventing
4 or fabricating new missions for running nuclear
5 reactors that would create more waste, why not get
6 aggressive, really aggressive about cleanup?
7 Instead of doing what we always do, which is strive
8 for the minimum possible, minimum cleanup required
9 by law, why don't we instead go beyond that? We
10 don't even strive for the minimum required by law.
11 Why don't we go all the way? Why don't we go for
12 every last atom?

13 Why can't the great minds that are --
14 these highly educated minds be put to good use to
15 find a real technological solution to the waste
16 problem? I believe if a fraction of the dollars
17 that were spent to create this mess, to invent this
18 horrific material, were spent -- a fraction of those
19 dollars, if they were spent on developing a real
20 solution, we would be there. I just don't believe
21 we have that commitment from our government.

22 And develop Hanford into a model site
23 for cleanup of nuclear waste. That's the only kind
24 of research that should go on at that site. Using
25 the minds, technological resources, and funds to

1 develop real and thorough cleanup technologies to
2 remediate the heinous man-made materials that
3 persist at Hanford could be applied at sites
4 elsewhere, sites that have also sustained ghastly
5 nuclear contamination, and would fittingly benefit
6 the entire globe. It would be a small return on the
7 debt that was created at Hanford in plutonium's toll
8 on mankind.

9 Thank you.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Did you – did you
11 have a written copy of that you want to leave with
12 us? Okay, thanks.

13 Okay, let me just find out – I'm
14 just going to count the number of hands of people
15 who still want to comment. One, two – I'm sorry, I
16 should back up, shouldn't I? One, two, three, four
17 – five people. Okay. I think that's right, five.
18 Thanks. I'll go to the gentleman here on the crutch
19 – crutches. Come on up.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll go last.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Oh, you want to go
22 last? Okay.

23 Come on up. Thanks.

24 STATEMENT OF CINDY DE BRULER

25 COLUMBIA RIVER UNITED

26 MS. DE BRULER: Thank you. I'm Cindy

1 de Bruler. I'm executive director of Columbia River
2 United, one of the Hanford Public Interest Group
3 Network groups.

4 First of all, I'd like to express a
5 little bit of concern over the structure of the
6 hearing, with some suggestions for the future that I
7 think would make a much more productive situation
8 for all of us.

9 The way that this hearing was
10 structured, against the recommendations of all the
11 primary groups, you left any type of organizational
12 representation out, as far as having any kind of
13 priority. And as a result of that, there's three of
14 us that represent major organizations – Gerry
15 Pollet with 17,000 members in the Northwest, has
16 been sitting here all night with his hand up. I
17 represent a group of 1,600 supporters all along the
18 Columbia River. Robin Klein just spoke, another one
19 from here, with Portland – with Portland Action.
20 It's unfortunate. You're the ones that have lost by
21 this procedural decision, because what has happened
22 is, you did not allow the organizations, that are
23 better informed on the issues and what a
24 programmatic EIS is, to frame the discussion for the
25 public. And as a result of that, what you've got is

1 a whole bunch of emotional comments on FFTF, which I
2 value very highly, but I doubt will be incorporated
3 into your beancounting, when it comes down to it.
4 Because they really don't address the scope of the
5 programmatic EIS. And I find that very, very sad.

6 I recently received the copy of the
7 responsiveness summary from the last round of FFTF
8 meetings by the Tri-Party Agreement. And after
9 reviewing the bean counting and the comments there,
10 it was pretty depressing. There was obvious
11 twisting, manipulation, lies, and deceits. And I
12 don't know what happened. I don't know if one of
13 the contractors sent out an e-mail to the employees
14 at Hanford, like what we saw happen in Portland and
15 Seattle, getting the Hanford employees here by
16 busloads to talk about cancer, saying, "Hey, send an
17 e-mail in with your comments," or what. But even
18 though the predomination of comments at all the
19 public hearings said, "Shut FFTF down and get it
20 into the Tri-Party Agreement," the majority of the
21 comments were just the opposite in the final bean-
22 counting. So I know that what happened at the
23 hearing here tonight allows you to leave out the
24 majority of what people have spoken, and I find that
25 very distressing, very sad.

1 I would recommend for tomorrow night,
2 the Hood River meeting, a couple of things:

3 Number one, that you at least allow a
4 couple of organizations to frame the meeting and to
5 provide their ten minutes of comments in the
6 beginning, so that you do get more useful comments
7 throughout the evening;

8 I would recommend that you don't have
9 breaks throughout the night, because as you've
10 noticed, there's quite a number of people who are
11 tired and who leave during those breaks, giving up
12 on their opportunity to speak;

13 I would recommend that you make the
14 suggestion, as you said that you would do so, for
15 people to limit their comments from three to five
16 minutes, five minutes for the elected officials and
17 three for members of the public, instead of the ten-
18 and five-minute time frame;

19 I would also recommend that you do as
20 you said you would do, and ask for people who need
21 to leave early, to be able to speak early on in the
22 evening, as I know we'll have a lot of families and
23 even high school students who are concerned and want
24 to voice their opinions.

25 So those are my comments on your

1 structure. I hope you can do better in the future.
2 I think it would benefit us all.

3 As far as looking at this information
4 tonight, I don't have any formal comments prepared
5 on behalf of the group; you'll be receiving those in
6 writing. But a couple of things that have caused me
7 to want to get up here tonight and speak. And I'm
8 barely hanging in there, so please bear with me; I'm
9 almost asleep. I'm still a mom and have to get up
10 at the crack of dawn with a teenaged daughter.

11 In noticing in your introduction, it
12 said, "DOE does not have sufficient neutron sources
13 to meet all of its projected irradiation needs for
14 medicinal and industrial isotope production,
15 plutonium-238 production, the nation's nuclear
16 research and development needs." Well, we've got it
17 there, folks. They already have a foregone
18 conclusion. And that's why I'm asking what's the
19 purpose of this PEIS, if it's not to determine those
20 needs?

21 Is it to find what is listed down
22 below, the role of the Fast Flux Test Facility?
23 Not, indeed, to question if there is a role for the
24 Fast Flux, but to find the role? Which has been
25 unsuccessful in the past, because there is no

1 justifiable role for that facility. So looking at
2 your wording in the information that you hand out, I
3 think gives the public a real clear picture of
4 what's really going on, and the limited ability that
5 we
6 have to affect this process. And that, too, I find
7 sad. You justify a need; you don't assume it. And
8 already we're going into a PEIS with a need already
9 assumed. You have insufficient alternatives based
10 on unproven assumptions, and I find that sad and
11 alarming.

12 Finally, I would like to just quickly
13 read what I hoped you would hear more of tonight,
14 and that's some specific scoping information of what
15 to include in the PEIS.

16 First off, you must analyze all
17 potential waste streams and their impact to the
18 environment.

19 You must characterize all existing
20 contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites
21 before adding additional waste.

22 You must do a cost-benefit analysis
23 for all alternatives, including total life cycle
24 costs. Example: comparing a linear accelerator to
25 the FFTF as far as what are they able to produce,
26 waste treatment, disposal costs, et cetera.

1 You must analyze the cost to the
2 current cleanup budget for both maintenance and
3 possible restart, with accurate start-up figures
4 that have to be recalculated and included and
5 justified.

6 You must analyze any other companion
7 facilities, their costs, waste streams, and
8 potential impacts to the environment, including
9 reprocessing.

10 You must analyze all transportation
11 costs and risks, including public safety and any
12 counterterrorist actions that may be required.

13 You must allow for independent
14 nuclear safety oversight of the FFTF restart and
15 operation if, indeed, restart is recommended.

16 You must analyze all impacts from
17 additional spent fuel storage.

18 You must disclose all safety and
19 environmental risk associated with FFTF restart.

20 You must demonstrate, finally, a
21 compelling need for any new missions recommended,
22 taking into account alternative means of meeting
23 those needs.

24 Thank you.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Did you

1 have a hard copy of information you wanted to leave
2 us? Okay, thanks.

3 I forget which side I was on. Go
4 ahead. Not on your side? On the wrong side; okay.

5 STATEMENT OF GERRY POLLET

6 HEART OF AMERICA NORTHWEST

7 MR. GERRY POLLET: I want to use the
8 overhead.

9 THE FACILITATOR: You can use the
10 overhead if you want to. Which mike? Yeah.

11 MR. GERRY POLLET: I think you folks
12 need to think about what you did the last couple of
13 nights. What you've managed to do is turn the issue
14 into your process and your unwillingness to listen.
15 That's what you've managed to do. To be as petty as
16 saying you can't use an overhead projector – you're
17 a lawyer, Jim, right? You know the value of
18 visuals, and you know that it's a normal process.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Gerry, I'm sorry,
20 are you representing your organization or yourself?

21 MR. GERRY POLLET: I'm representing
22 Heart of America Northwest.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's representing
25 the projector.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead.

2 MR. GERRY POLLET: Hanford has a
3 number of facilities in the 300-Area which are under
4 consideration for ancillary use in support of FFTF
5 missions. A number of those facilities under
6 consideration, in the event of earthquake, design
7 basis security threat – in other words, sabotage,
8 and the exact sabotage threat is classified – but
9 in the event of what is considered the realistic
10 sabotage threat, or in the event of fire caused by a
11 hydrogen burn from the release of hydrogen from
12 wastes stored or spread throughout 3-24, 3-25, 3-08,
13 and 3-27 buildings at Hanford, there would be a
14 release of radiation that is estimated between 50
15 and 90 rem. Now let's think about what does that
16 mean, 50 to 90 rem?

17 The Department of Energy calls it
18 within risk guidelines if unlikely accidents, which
19 have a 1/100 chance of occurring every year, expose
20 members of the public to 25 rem. At 90 rem, you
21 would expect to see serious injury from radiation,
22 and crises to the gastrointestinal tract and to the
23 bone marrow.

24 These are areas that are now publicly
25 accept- – publicly accessible, and therefore, under

1 NRC rules, the dose calculation would have to be
2 made as if the people exposed are the public.
3 Because in fact, that's who would be exposed. And
4 the same is true right around the FFTF reactor. But
5 under DOE guidelines – guidelines, mind you, not
6 regulations, guidelines – DOE does the calculations
7 based on a hypothetical individual who is not the
8 public on site, but someone 8.7 kilometers away from
9 the reactor.

10 DOE assumes that it can calculate an
11 allowable dose and say that we're within risk
12 guidelines by making an untested assumption that we
13 evacuate the public within two hours. There is no
14 evacuation plan to do that. There's no facility or
15 ability to do that. It's just an untested
16 assumption.

17 All of this needs to be reviewed in a
18 site-specific environmental impact statement, after
19 you do your programmatic environmental impact
20 statement. And only after that, if you then said
21 that you chose to examine further the FFTF reactor,
22 and you'd have to consider all the ancillary
23 facilities and their safety impacts and the
24 cumulative impact of adding another mission to them,
25 including those facilities in the 300-Area.

1 And you must consider, not just the
2 reasonable alternative of independent nuclear safety
3 regulation, you must also consider the full scope of
4 safety issues – evacuation, doses, calculations,
5 foreseeable accidents – and you cannot rely, under
6 NEPA, on a two- or three-decade-old safety analysis
7 report that no one in the public has ever reviewed.

8 The Secretary of Energy in December
9 1996 made a commitment. Got the news release from
10 December 20th, 1996, right here:

11 "'This decision moves the Department
12 a step closer to fulfilling the commitment made in
13 the strategic plan to no longer regulate itself in
14 the area of nuclear safety,' said Secretary O'Leary.
15 'Independent safety regulation will provide a safer
16 and healthier environment for our workers throughout
17 the complex and the public around our sites.'"

18 Your boss and bosses have decided to
19 renege on that commitment. But under NEPA, that
20 must be fully explored, because we have a right to
21 know what the difference is in terms of the
22 environmental impacts, and your bosses have to make
23 this decision with full knowledge of those impacts
24 and the differences between external regulation and
25 continued self-regulation, which is no regulation at
26 all.

1 The Department of Energy, in looking
2 at a new document I hadn't seen before tonight,
3 admits that there were twenty-five accidents at FFTF
4 from 1985 through 1988, that were serious events,
5 where the cause of the events were, quote, "the
6 procedure was intentionally not used," unquote. A
7 large number where the problem was not anticipated.
8 These include significant power transients. It
9 included a severe power plant transient when
10 lightning struck the reactor. Safety is not
11 something you can leave out of this EIS. It's not
12 something you can rush through and get done in three
13 or four months. And it has to be fully subject to
14 public review.

15 It is not sufficient, under the
16 National Environmental Policy Act, for you to say,
17 "We're just going to use the safety analysis report
18 we did behind closed doors twenty years ago," a
19 safety analysis report which the National Research
20 Council said, "Severe accidents in FFTF have not
21 been assessed using state-of-the-art methods
22 developed since the reactor began operation," that
23 was in 1988, proceeded to update it as you shut -
24 went to shut it down.

1 But there's no meaningful evacuation
2 plan. You don't meet the guidelines for the public
3 to be kept away from the reactor, for licensing.
4 The ancillary facilities are of particular concern.

5 We need to disclose what is the
6 additional impact of using facilities that are out
7 of compliance and that the Department of Energy
8 admits it is failing to request funding for to clean
9 up, as required by both DNFSB requirements, Hanford
10 cleanup agreement requirements, Federal Resource
11 Conservation Recovery Act requirements, and even a
12 consent order under RCRA.

13 THE FACILITATOR: One minute.

14 MR. GERRY POLLET: Those facilities
15 are extremely dangerous. They're within 2,000 feet
16 of the Columbia River. There are public schools
17 within two miles of them. And in the event of
18 clearly potential accidents, already those
19 facilities cause doses to the public of incredible
20 harm, far greater doses than were measured from the
21 neutrons outside the main gate of the Tokaimura
22 facility – far greater doses postulated. And this
23 is accepting the Department of Energy's analysis in
24 its risk data sheets to support its budget
25 calculations, so –

1 THE FACILITATOR: Ten minutes.

2 MR. GERRY POLLET: The last string
3 here is – the next thing that needs to be analyzed
4 in a site-specific EIS is, "Okay, what facilities
5 will we use? What are the safety risks?"

6 If we use any of them to fabricate
7 fuel or targets back and forth, what did it used to
8 take to move an unirradiated fuel from the 300-Area
9 to the reactor? It took an armored helicopter
10 overhead, armored personnel carriers with
11 rocket-propelled grenade launchers. This area is
12 now open to public access. I don't know how you're
13 going to do openness, but you have to consider it.

14 If you use plutonium fuel from Japan,
15 the last point here is –

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

17 MR. GERRY POLLET: This city, the
18 city of Portland, the port of Portland, the city of
19 Seattle and the port of Seattle, have all gone on
20 record saying you can't – "We will take you to
21 court if you discuss importing spent nuclear fuel
22 through inland waters without an environmental
23 impact statement." The import of the plutonium fuel
24 from Germany, which is highly enriched plutonium
25 fuel, poses unique safety hazards that have never
26 been assessed –

1 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, Gerry, we
2 have to wrap up.

3 MR. GERRY POLLET: - needs to be
4 assessed in an environmental impact statement. And
5 there will be a court challenge if that is not
6 independently assessed.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. DIRK DUNNING: I think I may have
9 to -

10 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, come on up.
11 You need help with your -

12 MR. DIRK DUNNING: No, I'm fine.

13 STATEMENT OF DIRK DUNNING

14 MR. DIRK DUNNING: Good evening; it's
15 not good morning yet, but we're close. I'm Dirk
16 Dunning, and I'm speaking tonight just simply on
17 behalf of myself.

18 Once upon a time - all good fairy
19 tales should start that way - a hundred centuries
20 ago, the ancestors of the Yakima, the Umatilla, and
21 the Nez Perce were around when the floods scoured
22 eastern Washington. They remember and tell tales of
23 moving to the high ground. They remember a hundred
24 centuries ago.

1 Eight centuries ago, my family got
2 its name and likeness on coins in Ireland and
3 northern Scotland. Three and a half centuries ago,
4 one of my forefathers, Theophilus, set foot for the
5 first time on American soil – not then American
6 soil, obviously. About a century ago, my more
7 immediate forefathers came to Washington State, to
8 the Ellensburg Valley, to homestead and raise sheep.
9 Half a century ago, my uncle was the number six
10 employee at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. He was
11 the millwright foreman for the first crew from Du
12 Pont.

13 Today I am helping, along with a lot
14 of others, trying to figure out what to do to clean
15 up the mess that was created a half a century ago.

16 One thousand centuries from now, the
17 fuel that is produced as spent fuel from this
18 reactor will remain lethal. One thousand centuries.
19 That's mind-numbing; I don't know how you deal with
20 something like that. Even many hundreds of
21 centuries from now, the fuel that comes out of FFTF
22 will have a plutonium composition which can be used
23 for weapons. It doesn't matter what the mix of fuel
24 composition is. With plutonium, any of it can be
25 used for weapons. There's problems, when you look

1 in those time scales, that are humbling.

2 I think all of us have great sympathy
3 and compassion for people who are dying of cancer or
4 ill with cancer, and we would like to do everything
5 we can to help them. There are other ways.

6 I had arthritis for a quarter of a
7 century – debilitating, incurable, can never go into
8 remission. Two years ago I put it into permanent
9 remission; it will not return. It wasn't using
10 mainstream medicine, it wasn't using anything that a
11 lot of people would be comfortable with. I did it
12 with my own mind. That's not to say everyone can do
13 that, it's not to say all things can do that. But
14 there are other answers.

15 Hanford is a mess. I was the guy who
16 found the problem at K-Basins, where plutonium was
17 separating from uranium and showing up in
18 concentrations that were rather surprising, in odd
19 places. Today there is 2100 metric tons of uranium
20 fuel in the K-Basins, 2350 tons when you include
21 cladding. That fuel is euphemistically described by
22 DOE as "damaged"; it would be more proper to call it
23 "rotting." The risks at the basins are mind-
24 numbing.

1 But they're beyond design basis,
2 because the design basis says that an earthquake
3 can't happen there that's big enough to cause the
4 kind of problem that I fear. By one percent in
5 energy, they are considered not credible. By one
6 percent. The difference of that one percent takes
7 the risk from being a moderate risk to being the
8 risk of losing agriculture in eastern Washington
9 state and eastern Oregon for five centuries.

10 Now we're talking about fifteen tons
11 of fuel added. This fuel has 20 percent plutonium
12 content, estimated. There is no home for it. The
13 proposed repository at Yucca Mountain has no
14 capacity – none; it is all consumed. As a matter
15 of fact, it's consumed to the tune of about 200
16 percent, because there were supposed to be two
17 repositories, one in the West, one in the East.
18 Only the Western repository has even been studied,
19 and it looks likely it will never be sited. And yet
20 this fuel has no home, and is a proliferation risk.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

22 MR. DIRK DUNNING: Once upon a time.
23 Thank you.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank
25 you. Do you have a hard copy of yours? Okay,
26 thanks. Great.

1 Additional comments here? I don't
2 see any additional.

3 Thank you for coming. This meeting
4 is adjourned. And thank you for your patience and
5 excellent comments. Thank you.

6

7 (Whereupon, at 11:30 p.m. the meeting was concluded)

C E R T I F I C A T E

We hereby certify that this is the transcript
of the public meeting called by the Department of
Energy concerning its

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

held on Tuesday, October 19, 1999, in Portland,
Oregon, and that this is a full and correct
transcription of the proceedings.

Karl Fuss, Reporter

William Wagner, Transcriber